

at 4 o'clock this afternoon at the residence, Belvoir, Woodley Lane, near the Episcopal Cathedral, and that the Sergeant at Arms will provide conveyances for Senators.

As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 7, 1912, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 6, 1912.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, renew our faith and confidence in Thee; continue Thy favors unto us; quicken all our faculties and make us strong to do Thy will that we may be faithful servants unto Thee and unto our fellow men. Let Thy blessing be upon the stricken wife and son of the Senator who has been called suddenly to the higher life, that they may put their trust in the God of the living and the dead, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting. Prepare us for whatever awaits us in the dispensation of Thy providence, and Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. Foss, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of the death of his father.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 25069, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use some time. We have used some excess of time on our side.

Mr. CANNON. How does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used 2 hours and 45 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has used 2 hours and 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a bill which I have introduced, being House bill 16844.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16844) prohibiting fraud upon the public by requiring manufacturers to place their own names upon manufactured articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, be amended so as to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The provisions of this act shall apply to any person, firm, company, or corporation engaged in the production or manufacture of any article or commodity that enters into interstate or foreign commerce.

"It shall be unlawful for any such person, firm, company, or corporation to place upon the market for interstate or foreign commerce any product or products of manufacture assembled and ready for use without printing, embossing, or stenciling the name and address of the manufacturer upon such article or commodity: *Provided*, That in case it is impracticable to place such name and address on the article it shall be placed on the wrapper or package containing it.

"It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, company, or corporation to erase or change the name of the manufacturer or manufacturers of any article entering into interstate and foreign commerce mentioned in this act.

"Any person or persons, firm, company, or corporation offering for sale or rent, or otherwise disposing of any property intended for interstate or foreign commerce shall furnish therewith the name and address of the manufacturer or manufacturers of said commodity or article: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to prohibit such manufacturing firms placing any other name, as dealers, upon articles of manufacture in addition to the name of the manufacturer.

"Any person, firm, company, or corporation violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined in the sum of not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisoned for a period of not exceeding six months, or both such fine and imprisonment, as the court may direct."

SEC. 2. That this act shall be in effect from and after six months after its passage.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill as read differs in some minor particulars from the bill as introduced and as discussed in the trade and manufacturers' journals throughout the country. I have amended the provisions of the bill by providing that only the finished product shall require the name of the manufacturer, making it unnecessary to place the name on the unassembled parts of a manufactured article.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. Is this the bill introduced by the gentleman, providing for the names of manufacturers to be placed on products?

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Has it been reported by any committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It has not.

I have also amended the bill by providing that it shall go into effect six months after its passage. The effect of this bill will be to abolish the sweatshop; it will stop the sale of prison-made goods in competition with the products of honest industry; and it will insure a higher grade of every product of manufacture that to-day does not bear the name of the manufacturer, in this way giving to the consumer articles that are worth taking home. It will aid in promoting health by preventing wearing apparel, food products, and tobacco and cigars from being made under the insanitary and diseased conditions of the sweatshop. It will aid laborers in every branch of industry and insure to the people wholesome and clean food products and clean and durable clothing. The whole public will be benefited by the law, and only a few who are specially interested and whose welfare should not be the sole concern of the lawmaker will be immediately injured by it, and in the end they will be benefited by it.

Many Members of the House and Senate have been made to fear the general effects of this bill. I do not think I exaggerate it when I say that almost every Member has either spoken to me personally or referred to me letters from his constituents with reference to the proposed law. It has been discussed and criticized in the manufacturers' and trade journals throughout the country. Objection to it comes from some manufacturers, jobbers, and a few retailers whose business, it is claimed, would be injured by its provisions. I do not take issue with those interests. I simply say that I am concerned in the welfare of the general public, and that no man or concern has a right to defraud the public. The object of this bill is to stop the kind of fraud that has been perpetrated from year to year by unscrupulous manufacturers.

I have hundreds of comments clipped from trade and manufacturers' journals. If it were practicable to do so, I would read them all, knowing that the objections they make to the bill are the best arguments in its support. Let me give a few brief extracts:

Congressman CAMPBELL's bill, if adopted into law, would cause serious trouble to the jobber and the middleman, especially. It would tend to eliminate the jobber, as nothing would prevent the manufacturers selling their wares direct to the retailers or the consumers.

The Campbell bill is inimicable to the best interests of the great majority of the manufacturers, wholesalers, and jobbers. * * *

Meanwhile, the opposition to the bill is only beginning.

We are glad to print, as we do elsewhere in this issue, criticisms of the Campbell bill of some of the leading jobbing houses.

Mr. Chairman, the objections come from these special interests, and in many cases are very bitter.

I have been told that if I pushed this bill the interests opposing it will defeat me in my district. My reply is, "I am pushing the bill."

The manufacturers who have women's and children's and other clothes made under the most insanitary, sweatshop conditions are opposed to the bill. Every dealer who sells prison-made goods to an unsuspecting public is opposed to the bill. Every unscrupulous manufacturer who makes fair-looking but shoddy goods to be used at so-called bankrupt, closing-out, and fire sales is opposed to the bill. Every manufacturer who makes fair-looking but, in fact, only sham imitations of similar articles for mail-order houses is opposed to the bill. Every manufacturer who makes, without putting his name on his product, cheap and inferior shoes, harness, buggies, organs, pianos, clothing, and food products, all having the outward appearance of being as good as any similar articles, is opposed to the bill.

In fact, every manufacturer and every jobber interested in deceiving and defrauding the public and getting money from the people for a thing that is worthless, is opposed to the bill, and all because it is known to these interests that requiring the manufacturer to place his name upon the articles he produces

will insure to the public a better article and protect the people against the frauds now perpetrated upon them.

Honest manufacturers and honest jobbers and dealers of all kinds will not be hurt and are not opposing the bill. Why should any manufacturer be permitted to place upon the market an article so inferior that he would not put his name upon it? No country permits such frauds as are perpetrated on the American public through the use of inferior products of unknown manufacturers.

This bill should have, and I believe will have, the support of every Member of Congress and of the general public as soon as its purposes and effects are known. In all essential principles it is like the pure food and drug law and will be as beneficial to the people.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am very much interested in the gentleman's remarks. I will ask him if the chief advantage of his bill and its chief purpose is to provide a means and instrumentality by which we may trace to its origin a dishonest product?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is exactly the purpose, and it has the further purpose of giving an opportunity to examine the factory to see whether or not it is a sweatshop and whether it is sanitary or not.

Mr. ADAMSON. That would serve the other idea, of protecting the people against the further production of such articles.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will ask the gentleman if he believes the provisions of his bill would prove effective for that purpose?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think so, just as the pure-food law has been becoming from year to year more and more effective and beneficial to the public.

When understood, after full discussion by that portion of the press that is not specially interested in any one particular industry, and that represents the whole people, I believe this bill, like the pure-food law, will have the general support of the country and of the Members of both branches of Congress.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, there is one other question I would like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMSON. There are a great many classes of goods used in one shape which are retailed, of course, in quite a different shape and form. There are various kinds of cloths and fabrics and a great many other things, and the gentleman will catch my idea without specific mention. I would like to ask him how the provisions of his bill would be useful to the retail trade and how they could be made so. If you stamp the entire bolt of cloth, how would that prove efficacious to prevent the retailer being swindled?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The bolt of cloth to-day is stamped; but what I want to stamp is the undergarment the child wears. I want to know who makes it and the shirtwaist the mother wears. The wearer has a right to know the conditions under which garments are made. Who has made the suit of clothes and under what conditions was it made; is the wearer sure that it was not made by some one afflicted with a communicable disease; was it made under such conditions as would justify anyone in wearing the clothes; was the cigar made under conditions that would justify anybody in smoking it; was the package of tobacco put up by a concern and under conditions that would justify anybody in using it; was the food product prepared ready for use under sanitary conditions.

Mr. ADAMSON. The material thing I am interested in—and the gentleman knows that I am interested concerning it—

Mr. CAMPBELL. The bill is before the gentleman's committee, and I am sure he is interested.

Mr. ADAMSON. As I say, what I am interested in is how he can frame the bill so that it will be effective in the retail trade, protect the consumer without unduly embarrassing or hampering the honest producers and the honest traders. Of course neither of us want to protect any other sort.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The provisions of the bill as it now reads apply to the finished product ready for use, as I have indicated, and I believe will injure no one who is honest with the public.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. How will the stamping of the name of the manufacturer upon the product indicate the conditions under which the product was put up, as the gentleman has suggested, whether under healthy conditions, and not under conditions involving communicable diseases that the gentleman has mentioned, or anything of that sort, unless the General Government is to supervise all manufacturing establishments?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The General Government and the State governments are now extending their influence over factories,

and there is assembled in the city to-day representatives of factory inspectors. There is no way of inspecting unknown sweatshops that make certain goods—

Mr. MANN. How would stamping the name on these goods do any good unless they are inspected and stamped by the Government inspector?

Mr. CAMPBELL. My view is that no manufacturer will place upon the market in an open field of fair competition either a shoddy article or one that is known to have been made under insanitary conditions or in prison, and it may become necessary to inspect and stamp such mixed products as food and clothing, as is done now with packing-house products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will.

Mr. AKIN of New York. In my district there is a factory where they manufacture covers for brooms. These covers are made out of very flimsy material, and they sell for in the neighborhood of \$3 a thousand. How could you arrange it so that they could be stamped?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a mere detail. I am now discussing the general purposes of the bill.

I have been asked a thousand questions in regard to this matter; for instance, how I would stamp a diamond ring, and all sorts of questions, some of them relevant, some of them raising a real important question, and others raising absolutely absurd questions. The people and concerns I am after are those who prepare food, clothes, and furnish products to the people generally of a character that ought to be what they purport to be.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Does the gentleman's bill apply to those people and nobody else?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The provisions of the bill apply to the products of manufacture.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks, and, like every other Member of Congress, I suppose, I have been receiving a great many letters in regard to the bill. I want to ask the gentleman in regard to one of the objections which strikes me the most forcibly, and that is the application of the bill to the woven fabric. Take the cotton fabric. It has to pass through two or three factories; one may spin the yarn, another may weave the cloth, another dye the cloth, and the point is made that this will cause confusion; in other words, what manufacturer's name will be stamped on the cloth?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The manufacturer or person that uses the cloth in making a finished product; who uses the cloth as lining or as any finished product ready for the use of the people.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But the gentleman's bill, it seems to me, at least the copy I saw, leaves the matter somewhat in doubt as to what would be the manufacture.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think as the bill was read this morning it obviates the objection made by those who have protested to the gentleman, inasmuch as it refers to the assembled products in an article ready for use.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has changed his bill from its original form?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; in that particular.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I was about to ask the gentleman if he did not think it would be practicable here to narrow the scope of his bill so as to obviate the suggestions—several of them, at least—made on the line of that of the gentleman from Tennessee, and make it specify more nearly the people he is after.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I shall be very glad to have the cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia to that end.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman think it can be done?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it can be done. I am discussing the general principle now that I think should be the adopted policy of this country. I undertook this work several years ago and prepared this bill and have spent a great deal of time in correspondence concerning it and in explaining it. My desire is to give the people better products for the money they pay out when they buy what they want. I am not particular as to the terms of the bill if they will accomplish my purpose.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. I have had some objections from my district.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. BOWMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has considered if he could include in his bill some provision that

would protect the State that uses the right sort of labor in its factories, that affords protection to women and children, and whether he could protect one State which was giving a proper protection in that way from a State that was not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. All States will have to be included within the provisions of the bill, or any other bill of like character. We can not make it apply to Kansas and Georgia and leave out Pennsylvania.

I have no doubt that some industries will have to readjust their methods of doing business, and that is the purpose of the bill. I have taken the matter up with a view of getting the subject generally before the country for further discussion. I have no doubt that the bill will receive the approval of the people generally and be approved by Congress when its purposes are generally known. The subject is of the greatest possible importance. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present an argument in support of bill H. R. 23465, introduced by me, to amend section 162 of the judicial code of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. L., 1139).

THE PRESENT LAW.

Section 162 of the Judicial Code, which this bill proposes to amend, gives jurisdiction to the Court of Claims over claims under the captured and abandoned property act where the property was taken after June 1, 1865. These are commonly known as the cotton claims.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

The bill I have introduced is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23465) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 162. The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of any claim therefor filed prior to January 1, 1915, of those whose property was taken subsequent to June 1, 1865, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 12, 1863, entitled 'An act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and for the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States,' and acts amendatory thereof, where the property so taken was sold and the net proceeds thereof were placed in the Treasury of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall return said net proceeds to the owners thereof, on the judgment of said court, and full jurisdiction is given to said court to adjudge said claims, any statutes of limitation to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided*, That no allegation or proof of loyalty shall be required in the presentation or adjudication of such claims: *Provided further*, That judgment hereunder shall not be denied by reason of any bill of sale or other conveyance of such property to the Confederate Government, in consideration of securities of said Government, unless accompanied or followed by actual delivery of such property: *And provided further*, That all judgments and payments hereunder shall be free from claims of assignees in bankruptcy or insolvency of the original owner of said claims."

This bill proposes to amend section 162 of the Judicial Code by the addition of three provisos, as follows:

1. That no allegation or proof of loyalty shall be required in the presentation or adjudication of such claims.
2. That judgment thereunder shall not be denied by reason of any bill of sale or other conveyance of such property to the Confederate Government, in consideration of securities of said Government, unless accompanied or followed by actual delivery of such property.
3. That all judgments and payments thereunder shall be free from claims of assignees in bankruptcy or insolvency of the original owner of said claims.

LOYALTY.

The first, dispensing with proof of loyalty, is already embraced in the bill H. R. 16314, introduced by Mr. WATKINS and reported by him from the Committee on Revision of the Laws (H. Rept. 224) of the present session. In that report it is said:

It was evidently the intention of Congress to allow this money to be paid to the claimants from whom the property was taken after June 1, 1865 (after the cessation of hostilities), without the proof of loyalty; but as section 159 of the act approved March 3, 1911, requires such allegation and proof, a conflict of opinion has arisen as to the interpretation of the law upon this point, and it is to settle this question that this bill is presented.

The report is right in treating this proviso as intending to remove a question and not to change the law. In *Padelford v. United States* (9 Wall., 531), *United States v. Klein* (13 Wall., 128), *Armstrong v. United States* (13 Wall., 154), and *Pargoud v. United States* (13 Wall., 156), the Supreme Court considered similar provisions arising under the acts of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 767), and March 12, 1863 (sec. 3, 12 Stat. L., 820), requiring proof of loyalty, and declared that the general amnesty proclamation of the President of 1865, 1867, and 1868 (13 Stat. L., 758; 15 Stat. L., 699, 702, 711)—relieve claimants of captured and abandoned property from proof of adherence to the United States during the late Civil War.

It is not to be contemplated that a defense should now be revived which was formally buried over 40 years ago by the Supreme Court. But since it has occasionally been suggested that such a defense may be asserted, it is deemed right to dispose of it in advance by legislation.

CONFEDERATE TITLE.

When this bill was passed it was believed that relief would be given to a large number of persons whose cotton had been taken after June 1, 1865, and whose claims were scheduled in Senate Executive Document No. 23, Forty-third Congress, second session. It appeared from the schedules in this document that this cotton had been taken by various agents of the United States Treasury after the actual close of the war, and that the net proceeds were in the Treasury. Petitions were consequently filed in the Court of Claims in a large number of these claims.

THE FACTS.

The records of the Treasury Department were furnished to the court upon its order and show that the planters from whom this cotton was taken had in nearly every instance sold cotton to the Confederate Government in 1862 or 1863, and received in exchange Confederate bonds, and that they had executed bills of sale for the cotton, agreeing to hold it in their possession until called for by the Confederate secretary of the treasury. It was never called for, but remained in their possession until Lee's surrender, as did also the bonds. In July, August, and September, 1865, after the actual close of the war, although technically it did not end until August 20, 1866 (*United States v. Anderson*, 9 Wall., 71), United States agents were sent to the various plantations to collect the cotton which had been the subject of such sales. The Confederate cotton records were then held by the United States and were used to trace the cotton. The major part of such cotton was found on the plantations and was taken by the United States agents. It was sent to New York and sold and its proceeds are in the Treasury, as shown by the document already cited.

A part of the cotton so sold had been destroyed by fire or otherwise; a part had possibly disappeared amid the terrific hostilities existing. On many plantations there was other cotton which had not been the subject of such transactions. The United States Treasury agents made little discrimination. They had the Confederate record showing a transaction of a named planter with the Confederate Government for a given number of bales. If they found that number of bales on his premises they seized it without regard to its identity, and it is apparent from the evidence still available that in many cases they took much additional cotton not comprised in the Confederate bills of sale. If the cotton described in them was not on the premises they took other cotton in the possession of the same planter.

The Confederate bonds which the planters had received had little market value when received and less the longer they were retained. They were, for patriotic reasons, almost always held in the possession of the planters until the close of the war, when they became valueless. The planter thus received nothing of value from the Confederate Government as a consideration for the sale. He received only a promise to pay, which was rendered worthless by the insolvency of the Confederacy.

It is the purpose of my bill to declare that the so-called sale of cotton to the Confederate Government shall not be a defense to a claim for its net proceeds in the Treasury, where it was made in consideration of Confederate securities, unless accompanied or followed by actual delivery of the cotton.

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES.

In proposing to do this the bill merely attempts to apply to the title to this cotton the ordinary principles of law governing transactions between private individuals. The following principles are well settled by many decisions of both English and American courts:

1. A vendor remaining in possession of the goods sold has a right, upon the insolvency of the vendee, to hold the goods until payment of the purchase price, even if title had already passed to the vendee.
2. This right extends even to property in transit before it reaches the vendee.
3. This right is unaffected by the execution of a note or other security by the vendee and its delivery to the vendor.

The following authorities support the first and second propositions:

In *Bloxam v. Sanders* (4 B. & C., 941), decided in the King's Bench in 1825, the right of a vendor to retain the goods sold to an insolvent vendee, but remaining in the vendor's possession, is positively and clearly laid down, as follows:

Where goods are sold, and nothing is said as to the time of the delivery or the time of payment, and everything the seller has to do with them is complete, the property vests in the buyer, so as to subject

him to the risk of any accident which may happen to the goods, and the seller is liable to deliver them whenever they are demanded upon payment of the price, but the buyer has no right to have possession of the goods until he pays the price.

If goods are sold upon credit and nothing is agreed upon as to the time of delivering the goods, the vendee is immediately entitled to the possession, and the right of possession and the right of property vest at once in him, but his right of possession is not absolute; it is liable to be defeated if he becomes insolvent before he obtains possession. (*Tooke v. Hollingsworth*, 5 T. R., 215.)

In *Northey v. Field* (2 Esp., 613), the plaintiffs were assignees of merchants to whom wine had been consigned and who became bankrupt after the ship's arrival, but before the time expired for paying the duties. The wines were sold at auction for the duties. Before the sale the agent of the consignor claimed them. Suit was brought by plaintiffs to recover the proceeds.

Lord Kenyon said he was of the opinion that the plaintiffs were not entitled to recover. The courts had of late years leaned much in favor of the power of the consignor to stop his goods in transitu. It was a leaning to the furtherance of justice.

See also *Winks v. Hassall* (9 B. & C., 372; *Townley v. Crump* (4 Ad. & El., 58).

The courts of this country have fully sustained this right, nowhere more learnedly than in *Conrad v. Fisher* (37 Mo. App., 352), where, in an opinion by the well-known authority, Judge Seymour D. Thompson, it is said, page 386:

On the contrary we affirm that, as between the vendor and vendee, laying out of view the rights of subsequent purchasers from the vendee, the vendor's lien is not divested by any species of constructive delivery, so long as he retains the actual custody of the goods, either by himself or by his own agent or servant. This doctrine is supported by the best English and American adjudications. "There is," said Shaw, C. J., "manifestly a marked distinction between those cases, which, as between the vendor and vendee upon a contract of sale, go to make a constructive delivery and to vest the property in the vendee, and that actual delivery by the vendor to the vendee which puts an end to the right of the vendor to hold the goods as security for the price." *Arnold v. Delano* (4 Cush., Mass., 33, 38), quoted with approval in *Thompson v. Baltimore, etc., Railroad Co.* (28 Md., 396, 406). To the same effect is *Newhall v. Vargas* (15 Me., 314, 319). "The lien of the vendor," says Miller, J., "always exists until he voluntarily and utterly resigns the possession of the goods sold, and all right to detain them. So long as the vendor does not surrender actual possession his lien remains, although he may have performed acts which amount to a constructive delivery, so as to pass the title or avoid the statute"—meaning the statute of frauds. *Thompson v. Baltimore, etc., Railroad* (28 Md., 396, 407).

See also *Vogelsang v. Fisher* (128 Mo., 386; *Robinson v. Morgan* (65 Vt., 37); *Arnold v. Delano* (4 Cush., 33); *Bell v. Moss* (5 Whart., 89).

The proposition that the vendor's lien is not lost by taking the note or other security of the vendee is equally sustained by authority.

In *D'Aquila v. Lambert* (2 Eden, 75) plaintiff shipped goods to defendants and drew bills, which were accepted by him. Defendants stopped payment, the bills were protested, and defendants made an assignment. The plaintiff revoked the consignment and consigned the goods to his factor, but the creditors of the defendants also applied for the goods. The lord chancellor said:

The plaintiff is substantially to be considered as a merchant selling goods to Israel. The case of *ex parte Wilkinson* is in point. It was determined, on solid reasons, that the goods of one man should not be applied in payment of another's debts. I must therefore decree the goods to be delivered to the plaintiff on payment of the insurance. The right of stoppage in transitu was first recognized by courts of equity. It was soon, however, upon the same principles of justice, adopted in courts of law.

In *Miles v. Gorton* (2 Cr. & M., 504) a bill accepted by the vendee was negotiated by the vendor, and the vendee became bankrupt. It was held that neither the negotiation of the bills nor the charge of warehouse rent while the goods remained in the possession of the vendor destroyed the vendor's lien for his purchase money. The court said:

It is an action by the assignees of a bankrupt who claims a right to the possession of some hops which had been sold to the bankrupt without paying the price for them, the question being whether the assignee, who stands in precisely the same situation as the bankrupt, can take the property out of the possession of the unpaid vendors. The general rule of law is that where there is a sale of goods and nothing is specified as to the delivery or payment, although everything may have been done so as to divest the property out of the vendor, and so as to throw upon the vendee all risk attendant upon the goods, still there results to the vendor out of the original contract a right to retain the goods until the payment of the price.

The same principle is asserted in regard to the right of stoppage in transitu, where the purchaser's notes are in the hands of a third person for a valuable consideration. In *Mason v. Lickbarrow* (1 H. Bl., 357) it is said:

I state it to be a clear proposition that the vendor of goods not paid for may retain possession against the vendee, not by aid of any equity, but on ground of law. Our oldest books consider the payment of the price (day not being given) as a condition precedent implied in the contract of sale, and that the vendee can not take the goods nor sue for them without tender of the price.

A designation of the goods by the vendor to the use of the vendee, the marking them or making them up to be delivered, the removing them for the purpose of being delivered, may all entitle the vendee to act as owner, to assign and to maintain an action against a third person, into whose hands they have come. But the title of the vendor is never entirely divested till the goods have come into the possession of the vendee. He has, therefore, a complete right, for just cause, to retract the intended delivery and to stop the goods in transitu. The cases determined in our courts of law have confirmed this doctrine, and the same law obtains in other countries.

The English courts went so far as to sustain this lien where the goods in controversy had been tortiously taken from the possession of the vendee by the vendor. See *Stevens v. Wilkinson* (2 B. & Ad., 320), *Page v. Cowasjee* (L. R. 1, P. C. App., 127).

In *Clark v. Draper* (19 N. H., 420), *Woodland Co. v. Mendenhall* (82 Minn., 483), the giving of notes for the purchase money was held not to affect the vendor's lien.

The owners of this cotton bring themselves plainly within these principles. They sold cotton to the Confederacy, but retained it in their possession. They received bonds, mere promises to pay, and held these also. At the close of the war, and the consequent insolvency of the vendee and maker of the bonds, they had a right to resume title to their cotton. The United States took this cotton and should pay for it under fixed rules of law.

NEED OF LEGISLATION.

What is the necessity of legislation? This arises from decisions made by the Supreme Court of the United States in the years not long after the close of the Civil War, and at a time when the proper historical perspective had not been established from which questions arising from the war could be viewed without passion. The Supreme Court held, in *Sprott v. United States* (20 Wall., 459), in the year 1874, that a person who had purchased cotton from the Confederate Government could not assert a claim to the net proceeds of that cotton in the United States Treasury. This decision was based upon the ground that payment for the cotton to the Confederacy was in aid of the rebellion, and the contract was therefore entirely void and gave no title to the property purchased. Justice Field read a very able dissenting opinion and two other judges refused to concur in the reasoning of the court.

In *Whitfield v. United States* (92 U. S., 165), decided in 1875, cotton was sold to the Confederacy, payment taken in bonds, and the property left with the vendor, by whom a bill of sale was executed, agreeing to hold the cotton subject to the order of the Confederate secretary of the treasury. While both cotton and bonds were in the hands of the vendor the Confederacy dissolved and the bonds became worthless. After the actual war was over the cotton was taken by the United States Treasury agents, and the net proceeds reached the Treasury. The original owner sued for the proceeds and maintained (1) that under the rules of law just asserted the vendor's right to the cotton remaining in his possession became absolute upon the purchaser's insolvency without payment of the bonds; and (2) that under the doctrine of *Sprott* against United States, just cited, the sale to the Confederate Government was void, and no title had ever passed out of him.

The Supreme Court refused to recognize the application of the rules of private right to this case, and said that the sale of the cotton to the Confederacy was in aid of the rebellion; that the owner's rights must follow the fortunes of war, and that the cotton came into the possession of the United States by right of conquest. Therefore it was held that the owner had no right to assert his vendor's lien. The *Sprott* case was cited as authority to sustain this decision. It was thus held that a sale from the Confederate Government and a sale to the Confederate Government equally vitiated an individual's title to cotton.

The *Whitfield* case is typical of those which this bill is designed to relieve. The reasons why it is believed that the rule there announced should no longer stand as the rule governing the relations between the United States and these claimants are the following:

I. THE RULES OF LAW SUPREME.

It is a settled principle that the same rules of law which govern the rights of private individuals in relation to title to private property also control the Government in like dealings with individuals. Thus the Supreme Court says (*Davis v. Gray*, 16 Wall., 203, 232):

When a State becomes a party to a contract, as in the case before us, the same rules of law are applied to her as to private persons under like circumstances. When she or her representatives are properly brought into the forum of litigation, neither she nor they can assert any right or immunity as incident to her political sovereignty.

See also the same principle asserted in the *Floyd Acceptances* (7 Wall., 666, 675); *United States v. State Bank* (96 U. S., 30, 36).

This is the rule properly applicable here. The question was one of the title to private property between the individual planter and two sovereignties. That was dependent on settled rules of law. We have seen that these declare:

First. That a vendor in possession has a right to retain the goods sold, if not paid for, upon the insolvency of the vendee.

Second. That his right is not affected by the receipt of a note or other security from the vendee.

These are the principles upon which the question of title, a matter of civil and not military law, should be decided.

II. RULES OF LAW APPLIED.

A like conflict arose in England over the rights of individuals and the United States to property belonging to the Confederate States at the date of their dissolution.

In *United States v. McRae* (8 Law Reports, Equity, 69) the United States filed a bill in the court of chancery in England to obtain an account of all moneys and goods which came to the hands of the defendant, as agent or otherwise, on behalf of the Confederate Government during the war, and the payment of the moneys in his hands, and the delivery of the goods in his possession. The court held that with respect to all public property acquired by the insurrectionary government, the right of the United States was that of a successor of the Confederate Government; and that they could recover such property from an agent of that Government, subject to the same rights and obligations to which that Government would have been subjected, had it not been overthrown.

In the case of *United States v. Prioleau* (2 Hemmings & Miller's Chancery cases, 559) the same court again held that the Government of the United States could recover the property of the Confederate Government, as its successor or representative in the hands of its agents, but that they must take it subject to all the liens and conditions arising from the contract upon which this property was received by the agents.

This is the rule which should be applied to the title of the present claimants.

III. DECISIONS AS WAR POLICY.

The decisions, both in *Sprott v. United States* and *Whitfield v. United States*, were rendered within a very few years after the close of the war. The reader of these decisions at the present day, when nearly half a century has passed, still can feel in them the throb of passion which that great struggle aroused. The feelings of the war were the real cause of both decisions.

IV. THE WAR WAS ENDED IN FACT.

The war was, in fact, at an end. The authority of the United States was no longer disputed. The armies of the Confederacy had disbanded. The soldiers had become artisans, merchants, and tillers of the soil. The taking of this property was therefore not in fact the exercise of war power, but a civil transaction. The rights of the United States should not be determined by the laws of war and the right of capture, but should rest entirely upon the rights of property as determined by civil law in individual cases.

The Supreme Court had already held that war existed in law until August 20, 1866 (*Anderson v. United States*, 9 Wall., 71), although in fact suppressed more than a year before. It therefore felt bound in *Whitfield v. United States* to give to the Government in the summer of 1865 the benefit of war rights and to refuse to the claimant the kinder principles governing the title to property under civil law.

The time has now come for Congress to declare another and truer rule. The ultimate purpose of section 162 of the Judicial Code is to declare the war at an end on June 1, 1865, to give a remedy for captures after that date, and to restore all rights of property to a civil basis from that date. To that end it is directed that all property taken after that date shall be paid to its owners. The object is to establish, as far as is now practicable, the conditions which would have existed had the abandoned and captured property act been repealed on that date. This full purpose can be accomplished only by the enactment of the bill I now propose, recognizing the rules of law relating to the title to private property without the assertion of rights derived from capture.

V. CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY ACT INAPPLICABLE.

A careful examination of the captured and abandoned property act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 820), clearly shows that it gave no right to the Government to seize the cotton in question. Its first section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint agents "to receive and collect all abandoned or captured property in any State in insurrection." A legislative definition was given to the word "abandoned" by the amendatory act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L., 376), as follows:

Property, real or personal, shall be regarded as abandoned when the lawful owner thereof shall be voluntarily absent therefrom and engaged, either in arms or otherwise, in aiding or encouraging the rebellion.

An equally authoritative definition of "captured" property was made by the circular of the Secretary of the Treasury of July 3, 1863, quoted in *United States v. Padelford* (9 Wall., 540), as property "which had been seized or taken from hostile possession by the military or naval forces of the United States."

Neither of these definitions includes this property. The owner was not engaged in aiding or encouraging the rebellion, because the rebellion had been suppressed; and the property was not in hostile possession, because hostilities had ceased.

Thus the seizure of this property gained no validity from the provisions of those acts. The real test in law of the rights of the parties should not be those arising under the protection of those acts, which were avowedly war measures, but the standard of right under recognized rules of law guarding title to private property. The pending bill declares and enforces that standard.

VI. ALL EQUITIES FOR THE CLAIMANTS.

The Supreme Court, in the *Whitfield* case, rests its decision for the United States upon a very strict legal title, depending on a rigid view of the disabilities imposed by aiding the rebellion. All the equities of the case were with the plaintiff. He parted with the nominal title to his cotton, and received therefor securities of little value when received, which soon became worthless. He retained possession both of his cotton and of the bonds. The maker of this security, the Confederate States, not only became insolvent, but totally disappeared from existence. The planter therefore clearly would be right in considering the cotton as his own, since he had never lost possession and had received no valuable consideration, and the vendee was nonexistent. The use of that cotton by the people of the Southern States in rehabilitating their ruined plantations and homes would have gone a long step toward relieving the immediate distress incident to the war.

But the United States, claiming the ownership of all cotton which had ever and in any form substantially or formally belonged to the Confederate Government, exacted the pound of flesh from the planter and deprived him of these tangible assets in his possession. At this late date, when the passions aroused by the war have subsided and we can look with historic calmness upon these great events, it is plain that so stringent an assertion of the rights of the conqueror against a prostrate people was an excessive exercise of sovereign power. It is therefore the object of this bill to undo the wrong thus done and to say to the few survivors, and to the children of the deceased that the cotton for which no real consideration was received from the Confederate Government and which remained in the planter's possession until the collapse of the Confederacy shall be treated as the property of the planter and the net proceeds now in the Treasury paid to him or to his surviving next of kin. The amendatory act is one of simple justice. [Applause.]

VII. NO REAL CONSIDERATION.

Lest the objection be made that the delivery of the bonds to the planter was a valuable consideration, a short historical discussion is now pertinent and entitled to consideration.

The sales of cotton to the Confederacy were between December, 1862, and June, 1863, and the records of the Confederate treasury department show that the price paid was from 13½ cents to 15 cents a pound, paid in Confederate bonds. In the learned work, published by Yale University, entitled "The Confederate States of America," by John Christopher Schwab, a table is given as Appendix I which shows the monthly value of gold in Confederate currency during this period, as follows:

December, 1862	2.9
January, 1863	3.0
February, 1863	3.3
March, 1863	4.1
April, 1863	4.5
May, 1863	5.2
June, 1863	7.0
Average for 7 months	4.3

See also *History of Confederate Treasury*, by Ernest A. Smith, publications of Southern Historical Association, volume 5, pages 225-226.

At the rate of 15 cents per pound in Confederate currency the planter therefore received from 2.1 to 5.2 cents per pound, or an average of 3.5 cents per pound in gold. Middling upland cotton was worth in New York during the same seven months an average of 70.7 cents per pound. See tables of New York prices in *Chronological and Statistical History of Cotton*, by E. J. Donnell, pages 518-522. It is thus plain that the amount paid in depreciated bonds was a very small fraction of the actual market value of cotton at this time.

Had the planter been allowed to hold the cotton and sell it in New York in the summer of 1865 he would have received

50.7 cents per pound in May and 43.9 cents per pound in September. See the same authorities. Allowing for all expenses of carriage, commission, and middlemen, it can be seen how great a loss was inflicted upon the planter by the Government taking his cotton. The remedy proposed, namely, to give the net proceeds in the Treasury, after the enormous expenses charged against it by the Treasury agents and their subordinates and the losses incident to the methods then adopted, gives but a fraction of what the planter would have realized had the Government refrained from taking it.

While the bonds of the Confederate Government were theoretically convertible into currency, yet the least study of the financial policy of the Confederacy shows the constant effort to secure the conversion of currency into bonds by its holders. Every possible effort was made to induce creditors to receive bonds instead of currency, even the railroads taking pay for services one-half in bonds. It is therefore plain that the citizens of the Confederate States, loyally devoted to its aims, purposely refrained from converting their bonds into currency to the disadvantage of the Government. Indeed, with the governmental pressure the other way they would have found difficulty in securing such conversion. See both the works already cited where these conditions are fully shown. For these reasons it may confidently be asserted that the bonds issued in payment for this cotton remained almost without exception in the hands of the planter to whom they were issued. After the lapse of half a century they can be found but in few instances, but this is not remarkable since during all the time they had been worth more as waste paper than as bonds.

THIRD PROVISOR—BANKRUPTCY.

The third proviso directs that the proceeds of claims under this section shall go to the personal representatives rather than to assignees in bankruptcy of the original owners of the cotton. This is similar to the provision contained in the bills for payment of the southern claims under the Bowman Act and the French spoliation claims (26 Stat. L., 908, 1456; 30 Stat. L., 1191, 121; 32 Stat. L., 218, 245; 33 Stat. L., 780, 811). Argument is unnecessary to show the propriety of giving the proceeds of these claims to the families of the owners of the cotton rather than scattering them among distant creditors who have long since forgotten their claims.

CONCLUSION.

All three of the provisos to this bill are essential to carry out the intent of the original enactment. In particular the second proviso should be declared the rule of law, because:

1. It is necessary to afford the relief designed by the original act.
2. It declares the war ended for purposes of these claims when actual hostilities closed.
3. It substitutes a rule of civil law for a harsh rule of war.
4. It recognizes a principle of justice and consideration for a conquered people in place of a merciless exaction of the utmost legal right.

Recapitulation of statements of captured cotton collected subsequent to June 1, 1865, sold, and the proceeds paid into the Treasury.

Number of bales sold.	Gross proceeds.	Total expenses.	Proceeds released.	Proceeds in Treasury.
5,697	\$750,702.68	\$209,338.58	\$87,511.24	\$453,852.86
20,240	2,881,589.90	705,622.47	289,576.92	1,896,390.51
6,375	838,043.92	232,487.94	33,809.12	566,686.86
1,170	175,075.16	40,826.13	134,249.03
2,205	351,601.97	51,565.51	300,036.46
2,398 1/2	334,361.92	31,561.70	302,800.22
2,402 1/2	490,743.87	68,187.02	422,556.85
9,712	1,412,335.68	540,962.38	127,192.79	744,180.51
3,378	416,229.83	279,883.13	60,420.00	75,926.70
53,638 Total.....	7,650,675.93	2,160,434.86	603,570.07	4,886,671.00

Mr. Chairman, I have presented this argument in support of this bill in order that I might have an opportunity to get into this record, and to present to the people of the country, the legal phases of the question which is now before the court, subject to the difficulties with which that question is met by the law officers of the United States. I do not criticize the legal representatives of the Government of the United States for presenting the defenses which they invoke in these cases. As honest men representing the Government, it is their duty to perform this service. In my judgment, however, it was the purpose of the original section 162, when passed by the Congress of the United States, to refund this money now in the Treasury of the United States to those who were entitled to it. It was intended that they should receive it, and these technical defenses having been interposed may prevent the carrying out of the purpose and the intent of the Congress of the United

States in passing the law, and the purpose and object of the bill I have introduced is simply to amend that statute in such a way as to take away these technical defenses so that the purpose and intention of the Congress of the United States in the passage of the original act, section 162 of the Judicial Code, may be carried out and these just claims paid.

In this time of peace, when we all stand beneath the clear blue skies as citizens of a great Republic, each one loving the flag that flies above us, willing to do anything we can to uphold and sustain it, simple justice demands that we should be honest enough—not only generous enough, but honest enough—to return this money to these people who lost it because they were prostrate and helpless, who lost it contrary to right and justice, who lost it by reason of the iron hand that existed at the time and demanded it from them and put it into the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER. Just a little more time, please.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I hope my colleague will be given more time. Mississippi is greatly interested in these claims.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I join in the request that the gentleman be given more time. He is certainly making a most interesting and entertaining speech, and giving us much valuable information showing the justice of these claims.

Mr. PAGE. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional time if necessary to conclude his remarks.

Mr. CANDLER. I thank the gentleman, and I will hurry as much as possible.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. With pleasure.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. By reason of your devotion to duty and Democratic principles you are always listened to with close attention. Your speech has thrown great light on this question, and will speed, I am sure, the payment of these claims. You have shown their justice; and they ought to be, and I hope will be paid. I favor their payment and will aid you in any way I can to bring about that result.

Mr. CANDLER. I thank my friend from Texas.

Now, permit me to say in conclusion, that this great Government of ours does not need this cotton money and can not afford to longer keep it. It only needs honest money—money that comes into the Treasury by the will of the people—for the support of the Government and for the development of our institutions for the great progress which is ahead of us, and this Government can well afford to return this money to the noble and brave people of the South who lost it in time of stress and strife. They come not here to-day, through me as their representative, as mendicants or beggars, because, thank God, they have always been brave and courageous enough to meet every difficulty which has been presented to them and surmount them all; and I am glad to-day that peace, prosperity, and happiness is in the Southland and is blessing our people, and that we are able still to meet our difficulties and overcome them; but I come as their representative pleading an honest and just cause, and simply asking this great Government to do justice to a patriotic people, and in doing so to do honor to itself, and give some comfort to them. In the passage of my bill this will be to some extent accomplished. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SIMS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7002. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to Salt Lake City, Utah, a right of way over certain public lands for reservoir purposes;

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 333):

Resolved, That the Senate have heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. GEORGE S. NIXON, late a Senator from the State of Nevada.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from Washington to Reno, Nev., for burial, in charge of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

In compliance with the foregoing, the Vice President appointed as said committee Mr. NEWLANDS, Mr. BAILEY, Mr.

WORKS, Mr. HEYBURN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. FALL, and Mr. ASHURST.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, we, as the representatives of the people of the United States, are charged with the important duty of voting the necessary money to meet the proper expenses of this Government in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. In view of our representative capacity in this respect, and for

the further reason that in a short time the people of this country will be called upon to select a President of the United States, Members of Congress, and other officials of the Government, it seems to me that this is a proper time to call to the attention of the House an approximate number of qualified electors in the various States. I therefore submit the two following tables, the first showing, for continental United States, geographic divisions and individual States, the distribution of males 21 years of age and over by literacy, by elements, according to the censuses of 1910 and 1900; and the second showing, for the above areas, the distribution of foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over, according to citizenship, in 1910 and 1900:

Total males 21 years of age and over by literacy, by elements.

State.	Total 21 years of age and over.			Native white native parents.		Native white foreign parents.		Foreign white.		Negro.		Indian.		Chinese.		Japanese.		All other.	
	Total.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.
Continental United States:																			
1910.....	26,999,151	24,725,825	2,273,326	12,654,689	557,042	4,438,275	60,691	5,858,042	788,564	1,640,076	819,251	30,652	32,315	50,943	9,448	51,675	4,923	1,473	1,092
1900.....	21,134,299	18,845,829	2,288,470	9,951,137	618,606	3,375,709	68,975	4,341,954	562,316	1,083,692	976,610	20,743	36,334	58,542	22,476	14,052	3,153		
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS.																			
New England:																			
1910.....	2,019,096	1,891,647	127,449	800,007	8,398	380,122	7,622	687,994	108,853	20,107	1,967	511	124	2,690	476	210	9	6	
1900.....	1,707,935	1,590,811	117,144	778,336	9,885	290,084	8,579	502,612	95,211	16,470	2,291	352	137	2,885	1,037	72	4		
Middle Atlantic:																			
1910.....	5,920,501	5,519,403	401,098	2,285,815	34,360	1,165,851	12,514	1,931,638	340,643	126,924	11,826	1,491	625	6,406	1,090	1,261	40	17	
1900.....	4,557,812	4,249,521	308,291	1,924,000	47,882	943,026	15,506	1,285,897	224,978	88,050	16,517	1,113	608	7,128	2,779	307	21		
East North Central:																			
1910.....	5,604,500	5,362,735	241,765	2,553,977	59,185	1,285,839	16,669	1,423,207	150,136	93,875	13,295	2,980	1,929	2,474	546	377	5	6	
1900.....	4,624,078	4,387,517	236,561	2,127,996	79,415	1,019,793	20,206	1,168,796	115,821	67,122	18,260	1,911	2,265	1,815	590	84	4		
West North Central:																			
1910.....	3,493,637	3,370,266	123,371	1,672,604	38,518	809,919	7,651	810,760	58,220	70,089	13,558	5,221	5,127	844	235	803	62	26	
1900.....	2,921,551	2,790,888	130,663	1,400,817	48,055	592,445	8,469	742,669	47,340	49,927	20,392	4,040	6,145	852	210	138	42		
South Atlantic:																			
1910.....	3,071,428	2,531,182	540,246	1,674,849	166,364	118,997	1,672	131,006	19,659	604,144	351,220	998	1,003	1,090	314	94	12	4	2
1900.....	2,496,785	1,885,154	611,631	1,288,262	178,564	102,929	2,555	92,415	11,768	399,824	417,400	574	813	1,127	529	23	2		
East South Central:																			
1910.....	2,096,186	1,689,656	406,530	1,188,811	148,311	67,864	1,482	42,677	3,631	389,783	252,677	224	353	274	71	22		1	5
1900.....	1,794,415	1,328,330	466,085	956,261	155,719	65,522	2,129	43,451	3,994	262,657	303,714	170	419	263	109	6	1		
West South Central:																			
1910.....	2,261,366	1,951,175	310,191	1,342,435	86,421	145,492	9,353	135,729	36,251	315,531	173,284	10,818	4,515	850	300	292	29	28	38
1900.....	1,684,099	1,263,113	320,986	862,358	81,520	101,218	7,817	101,359	29,572	188,974	196,379	8,172	5,263	1,023	436	9	9		
Mountain:																			
1910.....	933,558	850,709	82,849	430,653	12,195	168,927	2,089	226,353	31,219	8,285	707	4,392	14,062	3,869	1,187	8,101	1,380	129	10
1900.....	563,499	513,488	50,011	243,622	13,975	104,106	2,086	149,399	15,463	5,901	923	2,082	14,741	5,507	1,990	2,871	833		
Pacific:																			
1910.....	1,618,879	1,559,052	59,827	705,538	3,290	295,264	1,639	468,678	39,952	11,338	717	4,017	4,577	32,446	5,229	40,515	3,386	1,256	1,037
1900.....	884,105	837,007	47,098	369,485	3,581	156,586	1,628	255,356	18,169	4,767	734	2,329	5,953	37,942	14,796	10,542	2,237		
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION.																			
Maine:																			
1910.....	235,727	222,657	13,070	156,620	3,149	24,549	2,073	40,788	7,676	421	55	186	102	86	15	7			
1900.....	217,663	203,711	13,952	153,957	3,420	18,875	2,089	30,292	8,223	368	77	144	114	72	29	3			
New Hampshire:																			
1910.....	136,668	128,255	8,413	75,780	859	17,189	609	35,047	6,909	171	29	9	2	58	5	1			
1900.....	130,987	120,692	10,295	81,194	1,189	12,790	706	26,436	8,333	196	34	3	2	72	31	1			
Vermont:																			
1910.....	113,508	107,467	6,039	68,056	1,331	18,137	1,230	20,320	3,439	937	38	8	1	8		1			
1900.....	108,356	99,812	8,544	67,098	1,759	16,466	1,858	15,984	4,862	232	57	2	1	30	7				
Massachusetts:																			
1910.....	1,021,669	959,760	61,909	332,646	1,700	216,312	2,172	397,097	56,504	11,405	1,186	198	9	1,974	336	122	2	6	
1900.....	843,465	789,771	53,694	319,016	1,927	163,162	2,422	296,086	47,436	9,356	1,100	151	11	1,962	795	38	3		
Rhode Island:																			
1910.....	163,834	149,378	14,456	48,047	466	35,206	794	63,106	12,793	2,722	345	70	4	199	54	28			
1900.....	127,144	115,469	11,675	44,343	550	24,499	841	43,973	9,795	2,340	425	15	3	286	61	13			
Connecticut:																			
1910.....	347,692	324,130	23,562	118,858	893	68,729	744	131,636	21,532	4,451	314	40	6	365	66	51	7		
1900.....	280,340	261,356	18,984	112,728	1,040	54,292	693	89,841	16,562	3,978	598	37	6	463	114	17	1		
MIDDLE ATLANTIC DIVISION.																			
New York:																			
1910.....	2,836,773	2,666,743	170,030	898,051	11,443	646,481	6,383	1,072,319	148,704	43,582	2,295	1,102	604	4,227	580	966	21	15	
1900.....	2,184,965	2,054,951	130,014	767,286	15,201	524,856	8,240	728,698	100,776	27,884	3,541	872	605	5,117	1,622	248	19		
New Jersey:																			
1910.....	774,702	723,616	51,086	277,053	4,216	152,719	1,207	267,301	42,347	25,549	3,052	57	16	790	243	147	5		
1900.....	555,608	517,303	38,305	218,274	6,370	110,223	1,285	170,298	26,800	17,549	3,925	13		909	424	37	1		
Pennsylvania:																			
1910.....	2,309,026	2,129,044	179,982	1,110,711	18,701	366,651	4,924	592,018	149,592	57,793	6,479	332	5	1,389	267	145	14	2	
1900.....	1,817,239	1,677,257	139,982	938,440	26,311	307,947	5,981	386,901	97,902	42,617	9,051	228	3	1,102	733	22	1		
EAST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.																			
Ohio:																			
1910.....	1,484,265	1,421,267	62,998	822,368	19,188	291,064	3,379	273,318	35,160	34,019	5,169	37	4	403	98	58			
1900.....	1,212,223	1,153,525	58,698	672,480	25,476	252,267	4,688	204,083	21,605	24,422	6,813	14	13	243	103	16			
Indiana:																			
1910.....	822,434	788,851	33,583	578,478	17,641	114,432	1,953	78,325	10,602	17,339	3,312	62	12	180	63	33		2	
1900.....	720,206	680,190	40,016	492,509	24,937	108,284	2,944	66,065	7,022	13,144	5,042	43	13	141	58	4			
Illinois:																			
1910.....	1,743,182	1,663,739	79,443	673,612	15,588	404,043	3,275	548,617	55,907										

Total males 21 years of age and over by literacy, by elements—Continued.

State.	Total 21 years of age and over.			Native white native parents.		Native white foreign parents.		Foreign white.		Negro.		Indian.		Chinese.		Japanese.		All other.	
	Total.	Literate.	Illit- erate.	Literate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.	Lit- erate.	Illit- erate.
WEST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.																			
Minnesota:																			
1910.....	642,609	619,065	23,604	134,762	732	201,370	1,757	278,335	19,947	3,267	123	1,068	1,007	215	33	46	5	2
1900.....	506,794	485,938	20,856	103,840	737	135,288	1,766	244,033	16,720	2,018	150	607	1,449	117	31	35	3
Iowa:																			
1910.....	663,672	649,468	14,204	329,402	4,219	175,957	1,456	139,031	7,764	4,887	641	87	118	75	5	26	1	3
1900.....	635,298	618,237	17,061	315,569	5,944	149,455	1,791	149,660	8,246	3,466	975	10	81	70	24	7
Missouri:																			
1910.....	973,062	921,778	51,284	603,018	27,800	164,841	2,357	110,556	10,848	42,853	10,068	67	12	368	131	72	8	3
1900.....	856,684	796,357	60,327	516,715	34,723	142,855	3,021	104,817	7,666	31,589	14,829	21	5	355	82	5	1
North Dakota:																			
1910.....	173,890	168,423	5,467	43,155	203	48,572	290	75,692	4,029	295	16	636	915	24	11	49	3
1900.....	95,217	90,030	5,187	19,624	153	17,682	220	52,051	3,507	96	19	472	1,239	18	12	87	37
South Dakota:																			
1910.....	178,189	172,638	5,551	65,464	305	52,126	299	52,205	2,323	316	25	2,432	2,559	65	33	30	7
1900.....	112,681	107,053	5,628	35,162	219	26,267	259	43,231	2,215	154	30	2,113	2,887	126	18
Nebraska:																			
1910.....	353,626	345,081	8,545	167,158	1,401	85,368	643	88,459	5,886	2,994	231	506	329	84	22	494	33	18
1900.....	301,091	293,703	7,388	145,879	1,629	58,849	535	86,248	4,677	2,031	267	560	242	133	38	3
Kansas:																			
1910.....	508,529	493,813	14,716	329,645	3,798	81,685	849	66,482	7,423	15,477	2,454	425	187	13	86	5
1900.....	413,786	399,570	14,216	204,028	4,660	62,049	877	62,629	4,309	10,573	4,122	257	242	33	5	1	1
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION.																			
Delaware:																			
1910.....	61,887	55,615	6,272	36,005	1,672	6,283	68	7,084	1,692	6,221	2,829	18	11	4
1900.....	54,018	46,480	7,538	30,604	2,066	5,482	93	5,561	1,186	4,796	3,578	3	33	15	1
Maryland:																			
1910.....	367,908	336,670	31,238	195,187	8,097	51,781	523	42,936	5,037	46,479	17,484	11	2	265	94	11	1
1900.....	321,903	281,551	40,352	161,812	10,191	45,959	1,006	37,530	4,481	35,944	24,462	300	212	6
District of Columbia:																			
1910.....	103,761	98,679	5,082	49,624	325	14,012	66	10,928	810	23,820	3,801	18	4	237	75	36	4	1
1900.....	83,823	76,771	7,052	39,166	391	11,080	75	9,122	478	17,048	6,024	3	7	341	76	5	1
Virginia:																			
1910.....	523,532	430,615	92,917	304,610	33,488	10,487	192	13,585	1,297	101,726	57,867	97	36	101	35	9	2
1900.....	447,815	334,462	113,353	245,824	35,057	9,143	270	9,919	1,166	69,358	76,764	62	13	146	83	10
West Virginia:																			
1910.....	338,349	303,309	35,040	244,028	20,666	15,761	356	26,159	8,528	17,300	5,457	7	1	52	32	2
1900.....	247,970	215,904	32,066	182,192	23,024	14,482	553	9,983	2,895	9,202	5,584	3	1	42	9
North Carolina:																			
1910.....	506,134	398,571	107,563	302,413	49,619	2,192	91	3,022	274	90,083	50,669	808	895	51	15	2
1900.....	417,578	294,920	122,658	230,393	54,208	2,085	126	2,311	140	59,625	67,489	475	680	31	15
South Carolina:																			
1910.....	335,046	244,339	90,707	141,474	17,535	3,341	64	3,149	206	96,298	72,857	30	41	46	3	1	1
1900.....	283,325	183,809	99,516	108,454	15,043	3,231	68	2,825	154	69,242	83,618	12	17	45	16
Georgia:																			
1910.....	620,616	479,075	141,541	307,331	29,936	7,640	149	8,137	376	155,777	111,037	14	10	173	33	3
1900.....	500,752	342,505	158,247	232,015	31,914	6,692	108	6,331	376	97,363	125,710	5	1	98	78	1
Florida:																			
1910.....	214,195	184,309	29,886	94,177	5,026	7,500	163	16,006	1,439	66,440	23,219	13	14	147	16	26	8	1
1900.....	139,601	108,752	30,849	57,802	5,470	4,769	196	8,833	892	37,246	24,171	11	94	91	25	1
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.																			
Kentucky:																			
1910.....	603,454	515,938	87,516	405,210	59,314	41,864	833	19,058	1,382	49,736	25,958	25	23	36	6	9
1900.....	543,996	441,468	102,528	340,062	62,182	40,657	1,166	22,970	2,169	37,738	36,990	10	9	31	12
Tennessee:																			
1910.....	552,668	465,991	86,677	363,721	47,479	11,855	264	9,484	628	80,869	38,273	27	19	26	14	8	1
1900.....	487,380	381,529	105,851	302,377	51,244	11,472	444	8,779	730	58,840	53,396	13	15	44	22	4
Alabama:																			
1910.....	513,111	388,617	124,494	249,568	30,389	8,221	244	9,493	1,028	121,179	92,744	105	76	47	10	4	3
1900.....	413,862	274,213	139,649	185,370	30,690	7,876	286	7,434	648	73,474	107,997	15	23	42	14	2	1
Mississippi:																			
1910.....	426,953	319,110	107,843	170,312	11,129	5,924	141	4,642	593	137,999	95,702	67	235	165	41	1	2
1900.....	349,177	231,120	118,057	128,452	11,613	5,517	233	4,268	447	92,605	105,331	132	372	146	61
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.																			
Arkansas:																			
1910.....	395,824	342,384	53,440	242,872	20,343	10,983	385	9,057	661	79,352	32,013	77	18	34	20	9
1900.....	313,836	251,221	62,615	186,421	22,546	8,903	449	7,750	528	48,103	39,054	14	12	30	26
Louisiana:																			
1910.....	414,919	296,203	118,716	151,687	28,091	32,769	935	21,332	5,211	90,035	84,176	40	114	295	146	20	5	25	38
1900.....	325,943	203,305	122,638	96,675	24,681	30,062	1,120	19,102	6,238	57,086	90,262	37	120	338	211	5	6
Oklahoma:																			
1910.....	447,266	418,559	28,707	329,054	14,345	27,948	479	21,363	2,188	29,445	7,396	10,594	4,286	117	12	88			

Total males 21 years of age and over by literacy, by elements—Continued.

State.	Total 21 years of age and over.			Native white native parents.		Native white foreign parents.		Foreign white.		Negro.		Indian.		Chinese.		Japanese.		All other.	
	Total.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.
MOUNTAIN DIVISION—continued.																			
New Mexico:																			
1910.....	94,637	78,003	16,634	61,147	8,142	6,404	538	8,872	3,630	556	88	622	4,171	201	29	201	36		
1900.....	55,067	39,482	15,585	29,582	9,589	3,711	671	5,007	2,244	649	126	261	2,901	267	54	5			
Arizona:																			
1910.....	74,051	59,588	14,463	28,199	553	9,919	744	18,235	7,447	700	64	1,382	5,319	863	303	290	33		
1900.....	44,081	32,866	11,215	15,657	526	6,076	491	8,402	3,759	964	120	592	5,948	994	353	181	18		
Utah:																			
1910.....	104,115	100,638	3,477	32,780	199	34,632	173	30,699	1,966	542	26	132	753	197	127	1,656	233		
1900.....	67,172	64,702	2,470	18,031	290	22,278	200	23,277	1,129	341	17	121	656	376	161	278	17		
Nevada:																			
1910.....	40,026	37,627	2,399	15,173	46	8,597	49	11,799	968	214	15	332	1,195	710	91	750	32	52	3
1900.....	17,710	15,439	2,271	5,387	44	3,399	25	5,391	406	54	16	173	1,398	867	372	168	10		
PACIFIC DIVISION.																			
Washington:																			
1910.....	441,294	430,714	10,580	199,179	600	75,436	240	140,266	6,998	2,999	121	1,445	1,413	1,846	458	9,441	684	102	66
1900.....	195,572	188,937	6,635	91,802	460	29,823	169	59,332	2,413	1,089	141	825	1,907	2,534	867	3,532	678		
Oregon:																			
1910.....	257,188	250,728	6,460	140,537	729	39,983	185	59,576	4,033	752	40	695	540	6,217	493	2,533	301	135	139
1900.....	144,440	137,468	6,972	78,339	881	20,357	198	30,405	1,081	507	53	430	753	5,799	3,756	1,631	256		
California:																			
1910.....	920,397	877,610	42,787	365,822	1,961	179,845	1,214	268,536	28,921	7,587	556	1,877	2,624	24,383	4,278	28,541	2,401	1,019	832
1900.....	544,087	510,602	33,485	199,344	2,240	106,406	1,261	165,619	14,675	3,171	540	1,074	3,293	29,609	10,173	5,379	1,303		

Foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over, by citizenship, 1910 and 1900.

	Total.	Naturalized.	Papers.	Alien.	Un-known.
Continental United States:					
1910.....	6,646,606	3,035,333	570,588	2,265,121	775,564
1900.....	4,904,270	2,845,473	411,898	914,917	731,982
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS.					
New England:					
1910.....	796,847	324,100	48,314	366,226	58,207
1900.....	597,823	268,304	24,167	215,304	90,048
Middle Atlantic:					
1910.....	2,272,281	879,348	202,012	965,109	225,812
1900.....	1,510,875	825,262	100,091	381,823	203,699
East North Central:					
1910.....	1,573,343	813,819	148,254	424,948	186,322
1900.....	1,284,617	802,666	141,461	336,308	204,182
West North Central:					
1910.....	868,980	510,792	76,935	143,771	137,482
1900.....	790,009	516,440	86,650	61,899	125,020
South Atlantic:					
1910.....	150,665	61,134	8,997	57,127	23,407
1900.....	104,183	64,513	4,252	17,263	18,155
East South Central:					
1910.....	46,308	25,850	2,223	8,749	9,486
1900.....	7,445	32,037	1,719	4,662	9,027
West South Central:					
1910.....	171,960	70,775	10,076	52,872	38,257
1900.....	130,931	61,511	18,466	25,953	25,001
Mountain:					
1910.....	257,572	113,670	23,220	85,643	35,039
1900.....	164,862	99,129	16,455	27,158	22,090
Pacific:					
1910.....	508,630	235,845	50,557	160,676	61,552
1900.....	273,525	175,611	18,607	44,547	34,760
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION.					
Maine:					
1910.....	48,464	14,994	1,490	23,672	8,308
1900.....	38,515	13,242	784	17,143	7,346
New Hampshire:					
1910.....	41,956	16,415	1,421	19,377	4,743
1900.....	34,769	14,022	658	12,850	6,939
Vermont:					
1910.....	23,750	10,811	1,164	9,652	2,132
1900.....	20,846	9,560	639	6,949	3,698
Massachusetts:					
1910.....	453,601	189,126	30,016	212,633	22,426
1900.....	343,522	150,919	14,752	127,172	50,679
Rhode Island:					
1910.....	75,890	32,040	5,314	31,996	6,549
1900.....	53,768	27,840	2,071	17,027	6,830
Connecticut:					
1910.....	153,168	60,714	8,909	69,496	14,049
1900.....	106,403	52,721	4,963	34,183	14,556
MIDDLE ATLANTIC DIVISION.					
New York:					
1910.....	1,221,023	502,083	131,085	475,267	112,588
1900.....	829,474	481,362	59,748	189,715	98,649
New Jersey:					
1910.....	309,648	128,438	24,511	122,076	34,623
1900.....	196,598	109,460	12,765	45,591	28,782
Pennsylvania:					
1910.....	741,610	248,827	46,416	367,766	78,601
1900.....	484,803	234,440	27,578	146,517	76,263

Foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over, by citizenship, 1910 and 1900—Contd.

	Total.	Naturalized.	Papers.	Alien.	Un-known.
EAST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.					
Ohio:					
1910.....	308,478	142,465	17,509	113,856	34,648
1900.....	225,688	157,323	7,069	26,335	34,961
Indiana:					
1910.....	88,927	42,533	13,320	18,354	14,720
1900.....	73,087	44,364	9,830	3,155	15,738
Illinois:					
1910.....	604,524	317,339	43,482	174,581	69,122
1900.....	467,123	326,538	16,188	51,576	72,821
Michigan:					
1910.....	302,177	168,634	26,235	75,220	32,088
1900.....	261,415	153,377	31,122	37,449	39,467
Wisconsin:					
1910.....	269,237	142,848	47,708	42,937	35,744
1900.....	257,304	121,064	77,252	17,793	41,195
WEST NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.					
Minnesota:					
1910.....	298,282	179,187	26,222	58,132	34,741
1900.....	260,753	166,373	35,684	24,801	33,895
Iowa:					
1910.....	146,795	90,550	6,652	20,222	29,371
1900.....	157,906	117,507	5,627	11,372	23,400
Missouri:					
1910.....	121,404	65,512	10,117	25,735	20,040
1900.....	112,483	78,829	5,215	10,427	18,012
North Dakota:					
1910.....	79,721	46,636	9,824	10,965	12,296
1900.....	55,558	31,534	10,515	5,488	8,021
South Dakota:					
1910.....	54,528	32,495	8,020	4,376	9,637
1900.....	45,446	26,684	7,918	2,411	8,433
Nebraska:					
1910.....	94,345	57,270	9,928	12,343	14,804
1900.....	90,925	54,241	14,368	4,846	17,470
Kansas:					
1910.....	73,905	39,142	6,172	11,998	16,593
1900.....	66,938	41,272	7,323	2,554	15,789
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION.					
Delaware:					
1910.....	8,776	3,707	658	3,189	1,222
1900.....	6,747	4,109	275	1,287	1,076
Maryland:					
1910.....	47,973	24,256	3,278	13,573	6,866
1900.....	42,011	28,523	1,276	5,706	6,506
District of Columbia:					
1910.....	11,738	6,474	1,058	2,304	1,902
1900.....	9,600	6,733	657	1,294	916
Virginia:					
1910.....	14,882	6,411	859	4,693	2,919
1900.....	11,085	6,801	484	1,492	2,308
West Virginia:					
1910.....	34,687	7,263	1,358	22,545	3,521
1900.....	12,878	6,429	507	3,714	2,228
North Carolina:					
1910.....	3,296	1,439	194	827	836
1900.....	2,451	1,444	67	313	627
South Carolina:					
1910.....	3,355	1,602	184	739	830
1900.....	2,979	1,801	79	494	605

Foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over, by citizenship, 1910 and 1900—Contd.

	Total.	Natural-ized.	Papers.	Alien.	Un-known.
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION—continued.					
Georgia:					
1910.....	8,513	4,023	625	1,846	2,019
1900.....	6,707	3,952	363	949	1,443
Florida:					
1910.....	17,445	5,959	783	7,411	3,292
1900.....	9,725	4,721	544	2,014	2,446
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.					
Kentucky:					
1910.....	20,440	13,225	815	2,754	3,646
1900.....	25,139	18,731	682	1,692	4,034
Tennessee:					
1910.....	10,112	5,444	464	1,867	2,337
1900.....	9,509	5,746	280	1,193	2,290
Alabama:					
1910.....	10,521	4,736	687	2,895	2,203
1900.....	8,082	4,895	618	995	1,574
Mississippi:					
1910.....	5,235	2,445	257	1,233	1,300
1900.....	4,715	2,665	139	782	1,129
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.					
Arkansas:					
1910.....	9,718	5,284	595	1,388	2,451
1900.....	8,278	4,780	527	795	2,225
Louisiana:					
1910.....	26,543	10,024	1,171	9,169	6,179
1900.....	25,340	12,848	962	7,302	4,228
Oklahoma:					
1910.....	23,551	12,074	1,477	4,449	5,551
1900.....	11,540	6,609	1,447	693	2,791
Texas:					
1910.....	112,168	43,393	6,833	37,866	24,076
1900.....	85,773	37,324	15,530	17,163	15,756
MOUNTAIN DIVISION.					
Montana:					
1910.....	59,313	27,635	6,749	16,937	7,992
1900.....	39,983	26,268	4,018	5,397	4,300
Idaho:					
1910.....	25,844	12,817	2,478	6,215	4,334
1900.....	13,491	9,127	1,400	1,228	1,736
Wyoming:					
1910.....	18,285	6,837	1,937	8,147	1,364
1900.....	10,611	6,224	1,071	2,226	1,090
Colorado:					
1910.....	70,514	35,245	6,536	19,615	9,118
1900.....	51,162	29,678	7,317	6,539	7,628
New Mexico:					
1910.....	12,502	4,267	709	6,048	1,478
1900.....	7,251	3,568	432	1,973	1,278
Arizona:					
1910.....	25,082	5,912	1,113	14,574	4,083
1900.....	12,161	4,084	657	5,507	1,313
Utah:					
1910.....	32,665	15,351	2,416	9,628	5,270
1900.....	24,406	15,826	1,334	3,181	4,065
Nevada:					
1910.....	12,767	5,606	1,282	4,479	1,400
1900.....	5,797	3,754	256	1,107	680
PACIFIC DIVISION.					
Washington:					
1910.....	147,264	68,895	15,258	43,216	19,895
1900.....	61,745	39,466	5,511	8,012	8,756
Oregon:					
1910.....	63,909	29,675	7,501	17,430	9,213
1900.....	31,486	21,814	3,584	2,842	3,246
California:					
1910.....	297,457	137,275	27,708	100,030	32,444
1900.....	180,294	114,331	9,512	33,693	22,758

Mr. DYER. The above shows that in 1910 there were 71,580,270 persons 10 years of age or over in the United States, of whom 5,517,608 were unable to read or write, constituting 7.7 per cent of the population.

The native whites, who constituted nearly 75 per cent of the entire population, had the smallest number of illiterates, 1,535,530, or 3 per cent.

The foreign-born whites had 1,650,519 illiterates, or 12.8 per cent of their number.

The colored had 2,331,559 illiterates, or 30.5 per cent.

DECLINE IN ILLITERACY.

Comparing 1910 with 1900, there was a gain of 13,640,456 in the population of 10 years of age and over, but the number of illiterates fell off 663,461. There was consequently a decline in the percentage of illiteracy from 10.7 to 7.7 per cent for the aggregate population.

Among native whites the number of illiterates diminished 378,081, and as the population increased the percentage fell from 4.6 per cent in 1900 to 3 per cent in 1910.

Among the colored there was a decrease of 647,864 illiterates, and a diminution of the percentage of illiteracy from 44.5 per cent to 30.5 per cent.

Among the foreign whites there was the slight increase of 363,384 in the number of illiterate persons, but the whole number of foreign whites had largely increased, the percentage of illiteracy remains practically the same as 10 years ago, being 12.8 per cent in 1910 and 12.9 per cent in 1900. The tabular summary follows:

Population 10 years of age and over.

Year.	Total.	Unable to read and write.	
		Number.	Per cent.
1900.			
Native white.....	41,236,662	1,913,611	4.6
Foreign white.....	10,014,256	1,287,135	12.9
Colored.....	6,698,906	2,979,323	44.5
All classes.....	57,949,824	6,180,069	10.7
1910.			
Native white.....	50,989,343	1,535,530	3.0
Foreign white.....	12,944,215	1,650,519	12.8
Colored.....	7,646,712	2,331,559	30.5
All classes.....	71,580,270	5,517,608	7.7

It is gratifying indeed to note that the colored illiterates have decreased in the last 10 years from 44.5 per cent to 30.5 per cent. This shows progress, and I sincerely hope that the next 10 years will see even greater advancement.

On April 2, 1912, Senator BRADLEY, of Kentucky, in the Senate, in urging the enactment into law of Senate bill 180, providing for the celebration of the semicentennial anniversary of the act of emancipation, and for other purposes, said, concerning the progress of the colored race:

Since the negroes were freed they have increased from 4,000,000 to 10,000,000 in population. They own to-day, notwithstanding they were freed without any property, more than \$600,000,000. They have 135 private high schools. They have 30,000 teachers, 82 banks, 500 newspapers and periodicals. They have decreased in illiteracy 47 per cent. They have 1,500 lawyers, 2,500 physicians, several thousand ministers, some of whom are among the ablest men in the United States. They have 149 wholesale houses, 9,098 retail merchants, and 1,186 manufactories. Among them are scientists, poets, authors, musicians, artists, and inventors, and they have 2,000,000 children in the schools.

The object of this bill is to give them a chance to call prominently to the attention of the people of this Nation what they have accomplished and to show their progress, to encourage their people to the accomplishment of greater things, and to show the white people the extent of their improvement in order that they may better merit their help and sympathy.

Mr. President, it seems to me when we consider the fact that these people for so many years bent their backs in bondage in unrequited toil in order to make fortunes for others; that they were denied every right of manhood, every opportunity of education; that during the Civil War, notwithstanding their freedom was at stake, in the whole southern country not one of them ever committed an outrage, although they were left in charge of the wives and children of the Confederate soldiers who were fighting to continue them in slavery, now that they are citizens of the United States it is our duty to lift them up, to help them, to strengthen them, to encourage them, to make them better citizens, and to make them of more value, force, and virtue in this great Republic.

This is but a pittance, and it is conditioned upon their raising among themselves \$50,000 before they can enjoy the appropriation. I do not think that the spirit of economy should be such as to prevent the passage of any bill which has for its purpose the betterment of humanity, the betterment of our country, and the improvement of its citizens. I hope the bill may pass.

This Government should continue to do its utmost to help the colored man in his desire to advance in intellect, business, morality, and other ways. I am in hopes that the House will, during this session, pass the bill referred to above, and which has already passed the Senate, appropriating \$250,000 to help the colored people show to the people of this country and of the world the great advancement that they have made since they became a free people.

The colored men have heretofore been given opportunity to show their worth as officials of this Government. Some of them have and are now holding important official positions, and have uniformly given credit to the Government as well as their race. As proof of the above I might mention the names of a few of the colored men who are to-day holding important positions in the Government service, among whom are the following:

H. W. Furniss, of Indiana, minister to Haiti; Dr. W. D. Crum, of South Carolina, minister to Liberia; Charles W. Anderson, of New York, collector of internal revenue, New York City; Joseph E. Lee, collector of internal revenue, Jacksonville, Fla.; Henry Lincoln Johnson, of Georgia, recorder of deeds, District of Columbia; R. W. Tyler, of Ohio, Auditor for the

Navy Department; Whitefield McKinley, collector of customs, Washington; Charles A. Cottrell, of Ohio, collector of customs, Hawaii; Robert H. Terrell, judge of municipal court, District of Columbia; J. E. Bush, receiver, land office, Little Rock, Ark.; T. V. McAllister, receiver, land office, Jackson, Miss.; Nathan Alexander, register, land office, Montgomery, Ala.; W. C. Matthews, assistant United States district attorney, Boston, Mass.; S. L. Williams, assistant United States district attorney, Chicago, Ill.; James A. Cobb, special United States district attorney, Washington; Gen. Robert Smalls, collector of customs, Beaufort, S. C.; Mrs. E. P. Booze, postmaster, Mound Bayou, Miss.; Thomas Richardson, postmaster, Port Gibson, Miss.; W. T. Vernon, supervisor of Indian and Negro schools; W. D. Johnson, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and so forth.

The highest salary paid an Afro-American is received by the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Haiti, whose salary is \$10,000 per annum. A number of Government officials receive from \$2,500 to \$5,000 per year. Clerks are paid from \$900 to \$1,800.

The total number of Afro-Americans in all branches of the service of the United States Government is, in round numbers, 15,000, and the aggregate annual salaries paid amount to nearly \$10,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] 60 minutes.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, this Nation never more fittingly observed its birthday than it did on the 4th of July, 1789, when it approved an act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States for the necessary support of government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures.

Practically since the foundation of this Government—to be exact, since July 4, 1789—we have had a tariff law which has levied a tax upon certain articles imported into this country. This tax, as a general rule, has been levied for the double purpose of raising a revenue for the support of the Government and to protect our industries.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned, it has at all times stood for and demanded a tariff for this double purpose, while our Democratic friends have universally contended, as they now do, for a tariff for revenue only and not for protection's sake. In other words, they tolerate a tariff for revenue as a matter of necessity and at the same time declare a tariff which affords protection to our many industries a robbery.

What the position of the two great political parties upon this question has been and is well known in Congress, but it has not been understood by the people of the country at large, and we find in every manufacturing center of the country Democratic spellbinders deliberately attempting to deceive their audiences by pointing out the fact to be that tariff laws framed by them when in power afforded a measure of protection as well as raised a revenue for the support of the Government; while, on the other hand, other representatives of the Democratic Party before their audiences in different sections of our country have taught the doctrine of free trade and have roundly denounced the Republican tariff, or any tariff designed to protect our industries, as a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few, and by this method, particularly in manufacturing centers, have secured the support of protectionists, while with the doctrine of free trade in other sections they have secured the support of free traders.

It is my intention to place upon the records of Congress something from which the people of the country at large may know the position of each party upon this greatest of questions, upon which presidential elections have been lost and won for more than a half century, and for that purpose I desire to call the attention of the House to some recent statements made by the leaders of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives upon this subject, as well as to point out their official action with reference to various tariff bills which have been given consideration since the country thoughtlessly trusted them with power in this body a year ago, which will conclusively prove the facts to be just as I have stated them.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, June 7, 1911, on the wool schedule:

Mr. Chairman, in presenting this bill to the House we distinctly draw the dividing line between the two great political parties in this country from the standpoint on which they write tariff bills to obtain revenue to support the Government.

The Republican Party, as declared in their platform, presents tariff legislation for the purpose of levying duties at rates that will equal the difference in cost at home and abroad and at the same time protect a reasonable profit to the American manufacturers.

Their declaration is primarily in favor of levying tariffs in the interest of the great manufacturing classes of this country. The question of raising revenue is incidental to levying a tax to prevent foreign competition.

The Democratic Party does not believe that any interest in this country is entitled primarily to the fostering care of the Government of the United States. * * * The primary purpose from the beginning of those who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party is to levy these taxes for the purpose of supplying the revenue of the Government, and if any protection arises from the levying of these taxes it is a mere incident, which grows out of the constitutional warrant given by the people to levy taxes at the customhouse. * * *

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, July 28, 1911, on the cotton schedule:

As I have stated before on this floor, I am anxious, if we have the power to do so, to reduce every schedule in the tariff bill to a strictly revenue basis.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN, a Senator from North Carolina, June 12, 1909, on the tariff:

Mr. President, there has never been a tariff bill passed by Congress but that there were differences between individual Senators belonging to the same party in regard to some details or items in the schedules of every bill, and especially those items to be locally affected. But there was, and is now, very little difference among the Democrats as to the fundamental principles of the party upon this great question. * * * We have honestly differed as to whether some few articles should not go on the free list or the dutiable list; but, however we may have differed in this respect, the party has been united on the fundamental principles of a tariff for revenue.

Hon. ISIDOR RAYNER, a Senator from Maryland, April 29, 1909, on the tariff:

In 1876 the platform upon which Mr. Tilden was nominated declared: "We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretenses. * * * We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be only for revenue."

In 1892 the platform upon which Mr. Cleveland was nominated proclaimed: "We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only."

As I understood at that time, these tariff planks were written, respectively, by the Democratic leaders whose names I have mentioned, and they embody, in my judgment, our party axiom.

Hon. JOSEPH W. BAILEY, a Senator from Texas, April 26, 1909, on the tariff:

The practical question, therefore, between us and our adversaries, when fairly stated, is simply this: "Shall tariff duties be imposed for the purpose of raising revenue for the support of the Government, or shall they be imposed for the purpose of protecting certain classes of our people against foreign competition?"

Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, of New York, a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, March 27, 1909, on the tariff:

The protection afforded by our revenue law should be simply and solely incidental to the necessity of procuring revenue sufficient honestly and economically to administer this Government.

Hon. ISADOR RAYNER, a Senator from Maryland, May 29, 1912, on the metal schedule:

I contend for the proposition that we have not any right to protect the industries of our own States. I am for a tariff for revenue; I am for putting everything on the free list that can be put upon the free list consistent with the raising of revenue. If a tariff for revenue gives incidental protection I can not help it, but I am for a tariff for revenue. I am not for a tariff for protection with incidental revenue, and I believe that the vast majority of Senators on this side agree with me in the views that I have expressed. * * *

The overwhelming majority of the Senators on this side have always voted for a tariff for revenue as against a tariff for protection.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky, recently elected to the United States Senate from that State, March 29, 1909, upon the tariff:

And right here I want to say that no Democrat can justify his position before his people in undertaking to get a protective tariff upon something the people of his district produce, for when he does he strengthens the bands of protection everywhere.

Hon. THOMAS U. Sisson, of Mississippi, March 29, 1909, on the tariff:

I will go on record with all my heart by saying that I am opposed to protection on anything.

Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, of Alabama, March 30, 1909, on the tariff:

The Democratic Party contends that every tariff duty imposed should be primarily for revenue.

Hon. BENJAMIN G. HUMPHREYS, of Mississippi, April 3, 1909, on the tariff:

I am opposed to the policy of protection utterly, and by that I mean to say that in my opinion a tariff should be imposed for the one sole and only purpose of raising revenue for the Government. * * * I am not in sympathy with the so-called policy of "a tariff for revenue with incidental protection." If I should write a tariff law I would write it with the sole view of raising revenue, and whatever protection that it afforded would be accidental rather than incidental.

The first bill passed by the Democracy at our extra session of Congress a year ago was the so-called reciprocity bill, which was little else than a free-trade measure, and absolutely so, so far as section 2 is concerned, which placed print paper upon the free list, although it was known to all at the time that the cost to the American manufacturer was, according to the Tariff Board,

\$5.35 per ton more than to its nearest and most dangerous competitor in Canada, and notwithstanding the fact that the Canadians repudiated the proposed contract long before the meeting of this present Congress, the Ways and Means Committee of this House has absolutely refused to report, either favorably or otherwise, my bill introduced in December, 1911, to repeal this iniquitous and unfair measure, while one of our country's greatest industries hangs trembling in the balance as to whether it will survive or perish.

I think that it is one of the most important things in the coming election of a President of the United States to have the people of this country know where the parties stand upon this very important question of repealing this so-called reciprocity bill and putting print paper on the free list.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MALBY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There will not be any misunderstanding as to where President Taft stands, will there? He has not changed his mind.

Mr. MALBY. I do not think that the gentleman has any right to say that President Taft has not changed his mind, for I believe he has. Everything which has occurred since the passage of this bill could not fail to convince a man of much less intelligence than President Taft where the American people stand on this important subject. I saw in the newspapers a little while ago that when our distinguished President was campaigning in the State of Ohio he said that reciprocity was dead. I mean the reciprocity bill. So far as we are concerned, whether we voted for or against it—and the majority of this side were against it—so far as I have power to speak for the minority, that legislation is forever dead. If you do not concur in its burial, of course you can keep the corpse alive just as long as you want to and be responsible. But the people ought to know that you are responsible for it.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MALBY. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senate, as I suppose the gentleman is aware, did take up that question and acted upon it.

Mr. MALBY. Yes; and I did desire to call attention to the fact that despite the omission on the part of our Democratic Ways and Means Committee to take any action with reference to my bill providing for a repeal of the reciprocity bill, we find that a Republican Senate committee has acted favorably upon a bill which repeals section 1 of that law relating to farm products, which ought to be repealed, and amends section 2 by placing a duty of \$2 per ton upon paper. This affords some measure at least of protection to this great and important industry. I hope that when the bill comes over here there will be an opportunity to vote upon it.

Mr. PAYNE. Right there, if the gentleman will permit; it has come over here with these amendments and been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the majority of that committee, the Democrats, have voted to nonconcur in that amendment which repeals the law and puts a duty of \$2 a ton upon paper.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to my colleague from New York for calling my attention to the fact that the bill has already come over and that it has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and that the majority, to wit, the Democrats, have moved to nonconcur in that amendment. This shows conclusively their position upon the subject of reciprocity.

Then followed the passage of the bills revising the woolen schedule, the cotton schedules, iron and steel schedules, leather and chemical schedules, and others, without giving the slightest heed or consideration to the question of protecting these great industries.

I find, upon consulting the most recent records upon industries more or less affected by this proposed legislation, that there is invested in manufactures in this country at the present time over \$21,000,000,000, with an annual output valued at over \$23,000,000,000; that there are paid in salaries and wages about \$5,000,000,000 for materials about \$15,000,000,000. Over 8,000,000 of our people, in about 300,000 establishments, are engaged in the manufacturing industries of this country.

I find, according to the report issued by the Bureau of Manufactures of the Census for 1909, which is the latest available, that the value of the output of the foundry and machine shops for that year was \$1,228,475,000; the number of persons employed, 615,485; that they were paid in salaries and wages \$415,316,000. In the iron and steel industries for the same year the total value of the annual output was \$985,723,000, the number of persons employed was 260,762, and the salaries and wages paid amounted to \$189,393,000.

The value of the cotton goods manufactured for the same year was \$628,392,000, the number of persons employed 387,771, and the wages and salaries paid \$147,271,000.

In woolen and worsted and felt goods manufactured this same year, I find that the value of the product was \$435,979,000, with 175,176 persons employed, and wages and salaries amounting to \$82,524,000.

In the pulp and print paper industry, which was nearly destroyed under section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity bill, I find there were 777 establishments doing business in the year 1909 which employed directly in their manufacturing establishments 81,473 persons, with an invested capital of \$409,348,000, and paying wages and salaries annually amounting to \$50,315,000. The cost of material was \$165,442,000, and the value of the annual output was \$267,657,000.

I call attention particularly to that great industry because it is a matter which is to come before the House in a very little while. I might call the attention of the House also to the fact, if it interests the membership here, that since less than a year ago, commencing with August of last year, more than twice the quantity of print paper is being brought into the United States from abroad now than was brought in at that time, and that not a single new paper mill has gone up in this country since the reciprocity bill was passed, while a dozen or more mills have gone up in Canada, or are in process of construction.

Mr. ESCH. What has the effect been upon the prices of paper in the United States?

Mr. MALBY. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question, because the question of price is always an argument one way or another. It has not had any effect upon prices, and for this reason, as I called attention to a moment ago. Not a single additional paper mill has gone up in this country during the past year. The output of our paper mills is less than it was a year ago. They have simply permitted the foreign product to come into the country and be sold at a high price, reducing their own output by precisely the same amount that has been brought in. That has been the cause, and the output of our mills will continue to decrease in the same proportion as the Canadian mills continue to grow and increase.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MALBY. I do.

Mr. SIMS. How many new mills has the International Paper Co. put up in the 10 years prior to the passage of the reciprocity bill?

Mr. MALBY. I do not know, but I do know that the International Paper Co., which very largely does business in the district that I have the honor to represent, had sufficient capacity to more than supply their demand, and that they have got a greater capacity to-day than they are now using. It was not necessary for them to put up any new mills, and you will never live to see the day, unless this law is repealed, when a single new news print paper mill will go up in this country. And if you pass the bills that you passed a year ago and this year, and they ever become laws, in my judgment you have seen practically the last cotton mill and the last woolen mill and the last iron and steel mill go up in this country that you will ever see go up.

The proposition to me is so plain that it does not require any argument. There is only one of two things that can possibly happen when the tariff is repealed: Either our laboring men must work for what their competitors are working for abroad, or else quit the job. That proposition is so plain that it ought not to require argument. It does seem to, however; but if you are going to reduce the wages of the laboring men of this country to the level of those engaged in the cotton and woolen mills of England and France and Germany, I want to tell you that you want to increase the standing Army of the United States by tenfold to maintain order throughout the country and protect life and property. The laboring men of this country who have once tasted of good wages will never pauperize themselves to the extent of competing throughout the world with labor paid so inadequately.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MALBY. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. What per cent of the total cost of a ton of paper is represented by labor?

Mr. MALBY. Substantially all.

Mr. SIMS. Not 10 per cent.

Mr. MALBY. Oh, I know very well what it will cost. I know, sir, this, that you can buy from the forests of the Canadian Government to-day, or you could less than a year ago, for 50 cents per cord, the tree standing where you find it. You know that, for the evidence taken by the committee of which you were a member shows that. It takes a cord and a half of wood to make a ton of paper; that is, 75 cents' worth of wood. That paper is worth \$45 a ton in the markets of the United States to-day, and was when you made the investigation. Now, tell me where the money goes. Certainly not to the paper makers, who have never received in this country a fair or even a moderate return for the capital invested.

Mr. SIMS. Do you want to put a tax on Canadian wood to come here to make paper?

Mr. MALBY. There is no tax on Canadian wood.

Mr. SIMS. Do you want any to go on?

Mr. MALBY. No.

Mr. SIMS. You do not need revenue in that direction?

Mr. MALBY. We do not, when our country is depending upon Canadian wood. I am not in favor of a tax upon things which we do not produce in sufficient quantities in this country to satisfy the demand, except when such tax is necessary to protect the industry and those who labor in it, and this is not one of those cases. That is not protection. That is robbery; but it is your theory of a revenue tax for the support of the Government.

In the chemical industries I find that in the year 1909 there were employed 27,791 persons, with an invested capital of \$155,144,000, and paying wages and salaries amounting to \$20,222,000. The materials employed cost \$64,122,000, and the value of the annual output was \$117,689,000.

Notwithstanding the importance of these great industries to the whole people of the United States, and particularly to the millions employed therein, it is an astounding fact that the Ways and Means Committee of this House, which originated all of this legislation, held only secret sessions while preparing these bills, at which not a single person representing these great industries or otherwise was permitted to be present or heard, and even the Republican Members, among whom was the distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and a former chairman of the committee, were not permitted to be present during the time the Democratic Members were formulating these measures. In view of this extreme secrecy and lack of consideration, the results of their labors are not to be wondered at. I do not know whether my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has sat in the councils of his committee during the formulation of these tariff bills this year or not. He told me he did not last year.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman ask whether we were called in to formulate these bills?

Mr. MALBY. Yes; that is my question.

Mr. PAYNE. No; the bills which had been formulated by the majority members of the committee are simply presented in the committee, and we have an hour in the committee, and half of that time is used in voting on the bills and the report.

Mr. MALBY. That is all the opportunity you have had to consider them?

Mr. PAYNE. All that the minority members of the committee have had.

Mr. MALBY. Such a procedure as that ought to shame the legislative body of the greatest country upon the face of the earth.

Mr. SIMS. Was not the Payne bill passed the same way?

Mr. MALBY. No; the Payne bill was not passed the same way. The country knows that it was not passed the same way. I know and the gentleman knows that for many long, weary months the committee labored to give every interest and every individual in this broad land an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BARTLETT. The manufacturers.

Mr. MALBY. Yes; manufacturers, the people, and anybody who wanted an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that the importers who represent the consumers and have knowledge of facts that consumers generally do not were heard, and heard as fully and were as welcome to the committee as were the manufacturers, notwithstanding the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MALBY. Of course they were.

Mr. SIMS. When I said "the same way," I had reference to the committee's action with reference to the minority members.

Mr. MALBY. Not at all. I appeared before the committee, and I do not think that I was accorded a privilege that was not accorded to everybody else. I talked for an hour, and I know my Democratic friends were there; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the distinguished Speaker were

there, and asked me a number of questions. I did not see that anybody was hindered from being heard.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to suggest that there were various Democratic Members of the House who came before the Committee on Ways and Means, and I remember several who wanted a 300 per cent increase in the duties on peanuts. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. May I make another suggestion?

Mr. MALBY. I would be glad to have the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that we not only heard everybody who wanted to be heard, but we went out into the highways and byways and invited men to come in. I wrote a number of letters to distinguished gentlemen who had been writing upon the subject of the tariff for years, claiming that they knew all about the tariff and why it should be lowered. I asked them to come before the committee and make their statement, and they straightway began to make excuses, and did not appear.

Mr. DALZELL. Let me suggest that we subpoenaed parties to come before the committee.

Mr. MALBY. I think the country ought to know the difference in the methods employed in the revision of this tariff bill and those which were observed in the formulation of the Payne bill, because I am trying to lay the foundation by calling your attention to Democratic methods of the importance of the maintenance of this present Tariff Board, and I think I will be able to demonstrate that before I close.

It is certainly a remarkable thing that in a great country like ours, where we have a little matter of \$21,000,000,000 of the people's money invested in manufacturing and \$23,000,000,000 annual output and 8,000,000 people employed in that industry, when there was a general demand on the part of all the people interested for a hearing before the most popular, the most important committee in the House of Representatives, which rises to the sublime dignity of being the most important and far-reaching committee in any legislative body in the known world, a committee that ought to be a committee before whom the poorest as well as the richest may freely appear and say what he has to say and have it fairly and carefully considered—I say it is simply remarkable that they should not have had that opportunity.

We are the greatest manufacturing country, and have been for many years, on the whole earth. Therefore is not this a subject entitled to the most careful and nonpartisan consideration of any which comes before Congress, and is it not our fair duty to furnish ourselves and to furnish the people of this country with adequate information upon this most important subject. And when the committee of this House which is chargeable with legislation affecting these vast interests legislates for 90,000,000 people, is it not according to the rule of common decency and fairness that that committee should accord, as it has every time the Republicans have revised this schedule, to the people of this country the humble privilege of appearing before it and having a hearing with respect to those things in which we are all interested and which are so intimately tied up with the welfare of the people of this whole Nation? I desire to call the attention of the House particularly to these bills, which were acted upon in the dark, in a perfectly star-chamber way, when no one's interest was given the slightest possible consideration.

Fortunately for the people of this country, all of these bills had to be sent to our able and fearless President, who, true to the promises made to the people who trusted and elected him, vetoed them all, because he knew and was in possession of all these facts concerning the formulation of these bills, and realized that no consideration whatever had been given to the question of protection, but on the contrary, the Democracy, true to their idol, free trade, had only considered the subject from a free-trade and revenue standpoint, and even as to that had little or no information upon which to base an intelligent judgment.

Then came the final struggle to pass them over the President's veto, but again, fortunately for the people of our country, the Republican Members of this House, true to their principles and platform, defeated them in this final attempt to fasten upon the manufacturing industries of the country this most infamous of all tariff legislation, which has never been exceeded in all our history.

At this regular session of Congress most of these same bills, in substantially the same form, and again with little or no adequate consideration and no public hearings and in defiance of the findings of the Tariff Board as to the cost of production at home and abroad, have again been presented to this House and passed, and will undoubtedly receive the same consideration

from President Taft as upon their former visit, if presented for his consideration.

I believe that the people of this country by a very large majority favor the Republican ideas of a protective tariff—that is, one which will fairly represent the difference between the cost of production here and in other countries.

The difficulty and contention has been, however, that this difference is impossible of ascertainment and that it has not found a place in any of our tariff bills. Great difficulties undoubtedly exist, but not such as are insurmountable or impossible of solution so as to answer all practical purposes.

Peary was not at the North Pole, but upon submitting his proofs, which clearly showed that he was not exactly there, he demonstrated that he was practically as near as anyone will ever get, and hence was very properly credited by scientists throughout the whole world with the successful accomplishment of this arduous task and was universally proclaimed as its original and only discoverer.

We can attain perfection in only a few things, but we may so closely approach it as to answer all practical purposes.

There has been some feeling on the part of the people that the tariff legislation passed in recent years did not fairly represent the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, and particularly that the tariff rates were higher than these differences would warrant, and this impression, whether well founded or not, and I think mostly unwarranted, has caused much criticism and dissatisfaction with our tariff legislation. Could this impression be removed, as it could be, and a bill framed along these lines, there can be no doubt but that it would meet with the general approval of a great majority of the citizens of this country.

While it is true that our tariff measures have not merited the criticisms that have been made against them, and it is true that much time and patience was given to their consideration, and that they are much more accurate than anything that has been offered to take their place, yet it was believed by President Taft and by Congress that even better results could be obtained by additional methods which would furnish to the President and to the Congress as well as to the country at large more definite information, and hence a Tariff Board was created for this especial purpose.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the results of their labors, let us pause long enough to inquire as to the personnel of this board and the uses to which their labors may be applied.

The tariff act of August 5, 1909, commonly known as the Payne-Aldrich bill, contains, in article 718, section 2, the following provision:

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section—

That is, relating to the application of the maximum and minimum rates—

and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

Under the authority thus given, the President, by a letter dated September 14, 1909, appointed three persons to assist him in the manner contemplated by the act and designated them as constituting the Tariff Board. The persons so appointed were Prof. Henry C. Emery, professor of political economy in Yale University; Alvin H. Sanders, editor of the *Breeders' Gazette*, a leading agricultural journal, and for 30 years a student and writer on agricultural subjects; and James B. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and for some four years previous in charge of customs.

During the short session of the Sixty-first Congress bills were introduced to make the Tariff Board permanent, increasing its membership to five, and more clearly defining its powers. A bill was adopted by each House of Congress in slightly different form, but failed in final enactment during the last hours of the session.

President Taft, determined upon carrying out what he believed to be the wishes of Congress, appointed, on March 4, 1911, two additional members of the Tariff Board, thus raising its membership to five, selecting two Democrats, the three previous members of the board being understood to be of the Republican faith, thus putting into effect two of the most important provisions of the bill creating the Tariff Board, to which I have referred.

The two new members of the Tariff Board were Prof. Thomas W. Page, professor of economics in the University of Virginia and previously dean of the College of Commerce, University of California, and Hon. William M. Howard, for 14 years a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia, who had given most distinguished service in that body.

It will thus be seen that in the selection of the Tariff Board the President was actuated by a sincere desire to secure the very best results by the selection of as able men as could be found in the whole country and at the same time make it non-partisan.

The arduous character of the duties they were called upon to perform can not be overestimated and is little appreciated. In order, however, that the public may have some idea of the work which the Tariff Board has accomplished and its appreciation by others since its organization in March, 1911, I desire to call the attention of the House to a communication from the National Tariff Commission Association, addressed to Mr. John Candler Cobb, president of the National Tariff Commission Association, which reads as follows:

THE NATIONAL TARIFF COMMISSION ASSOCIATION,
New York, June 14, 1911.

MR. JOHN CANDLER COBB,
President The National Tariff Commission Association.

DEAR SIR: Under the permission given at your request by President Taft, in his letter to you of May 4, 1911, the committee of our association selected to investigate and report on the organization, methods, and work of the Tariff Board submit the subjoined report.

The President's action was predicated on the concurrence of the Tariff Board, whose chairman, in a letter to the President, dated May 2, 1911, wrote:

"I beg to say that the Tariff Board are unanimous in welcoming this proposal, and that we shall be very glad indeed to have a committee of the National Tariff Commission Association make a thorough examination of our work and to offer them every facility for doing so."

Five members of our committee went to Washington in order to investigate the organization and work of the Tariff Board, with which most of them were previously more or less familiar, and devoted much additional time to reviewing the information thus obtained and in reaching conclusions thereon. We undertook the investigation with open minds, without previous comment or prejudice either for or against the Tariff Board and its methods. Our effort throughout was to ascertain facts. The conclusions reached represent the unanimous judgment of the committee.

Our investigation was so thorough and the information gathered so voluminous that our record of the results is necessarily somewhat extensive. To facilitate its use we have divided it into two parts, namely, the report, which summarizes the essential facts and states our conclusions thereon, and a supplement, which contains a historical review of the Tariff Board and gives the detailed information on which our conclusions are based. Those who desire a full understanding of the matter should read both papers.

The committee desires to record its appreciation of the cordial cooperation and assistance given to it throughout by each and all of the members of the Tariff Board. Unlimited opportunity was afforded us in our investigations of the work and methods of the board, the organization of the staff, the rates of salaries paid, and the kind and amount of all other expenses incurred. Every inquiry by us was responded to unreservedly and satisfactorily. We are justified, therefore, in stating that our conclusions are based upon a full and intelligent understanding of the facts.

Respectfully,
HENRY R. TOWNE, Chairman,
President Merchants' Association of New York, N. Y.

JOHN KIRBY, Jr.,
President National Association of Manufacturers, Ohio.

CHARLES M. JARVIS,
Vice President National Association
of Manufacturers, Connecticut.

J. J. CULBERTSON,
President Southern Cottonseed Crushers' Association, Texas.

H. E. MILES,
Ex-President National Association of Implement
and Vehicle Manufacturers, Texas.

FRANCIS T. SIMMONS,
Member Executive Council, Chicago
Association of Commerce, Illinois.

The National Tariff Commission Association report, to which they refer in the above communication, is in part as follows:

Our committee was favorably impressed with the character, ability, and fitness of the members of the Tariff Board appointed by President Taft. We think it fortunate that the country has been able to secure for service in this new and untried field five men who, on the whole, are so well equipped for their duties, so impartial, and able in so short a time to organize the work on an effective basis. In this connection it is important to keep in mind that the functions of the Tariff Board are administrative and judicial; that its members were not selected as technical experts in any one field of industry; that the work of technical investigation will be done by many experts employed for this purpose by the board; and that the highest function of the board will consist in weighing the evidence thus gathered, in reaching sound conclusion thereon, and embodying all essential facts in its reports. In this respect the board acts as a court of first instance to review the evidence gathered by its experts and to pass judgment thereon. It thus fulfills the functions of a commission appointed by a court of justice to make findings of fact for the information of the court. Briefly, the motto of the board might be, "To furnish facts, not opinions."

For the technical investigations which the work involves the board utilizes the services of the trained experts, carefully selected with reference to their ability and past experience in each line of investigation taken up, and the experience thus far indicates that men possessing the requisite experience, skill, and knowledge can be secured on fair terms. Members of our commission passed in review every important employee of the board, except those absent on field work, investigated their duties, ascertained the salaries paid, and thus informed themselves generally concerning the business organization and methods thus far developed. The resulting impression was unexpectedly satisfactory and fully justifies the statement that the administration of the work of the Tariff Board is on a sound, economical, and businesslike basis, which does credit to the members of the board and demonstrates conclusively their fitness to perform the executive functions which their duties

involve. Their equal fitness to perform intelligently and impartially the judicial function, which constitutes the other and greater part of their duty, may be judged from the two reports which they have thus far rendered.

Our committee, although previously familiar with the subject, was deeply impressed by the immense complexity and scope of the work which the Tariff Board has undertaken, and also by the progress already made in creating an organization for its effective conduct, and by the volume of work accomplished in the past eight months, or since October 1, 1910, when the board was first effectively organized. The actual achievement during this short period justifies the prediction that the work on other important schedules can be completed in similar periods or less, and on the simpler schedules in proportionally shorter time. When the initial work has once been completed the continuing work of keeping it revised and corrected to date will be relatively easy and simple.

Commenting on one of the issued reports, an official of the Royal Imperial Ministry of Commerce of Austria, regarded in Europe as a leading authority on tariff questions, says:

"The report is excellent and in line with the latest theory, and I know of no European publication which so correctly interprets the most important features of the question of commercial policy as does your report on the paper industry. This is a very good beginning, and I already see that you will leave all European government departments far behind in the publication of model reports on questions of commercial policy. This report will attract great attention in Europe."

The observations of our commission confirm and justify these favorable comments. We believe the reports of the Tariff Board as they are issued will prove to be of great value not only to Congress and the executive departments of the Government but also to American producers in all fields of industry, collectively and individually. We predict that this opinion will be indorsed by the latter as rapidly as they have opportunity to receive and study the reports relating to their respective lines of industry.

It is earnestly to be hoped that at an early date Congress will enact a law making the Tariff Board a permanent part of the machinery of the Federal Government, and in so doing Congress will make provision whereby the board shall on request report directly to Congress or to either House thereof, concerning any matter within its field of investigation and concerning which its work has been completed or sufficiently advanced to enable it to respond to such a call.

In conclusion our committee find that the Tariff Board is composed of able, impartial, and earnest men, who are devoting their energies unreservedly to the work before them; that the staff has been carefully selected for the work in view; is efficiently organized and directed, and includes a number of exceptionally competent technical experts; that the scale of salaries is reasonable—indeed, moderate—and that all other expenditures are closely scrutinized and appear to be equally reasonable; that the work of the board, vast and intricate in detail, is already highly organized, well systematized, and running smoothly; and that Congress and the people can now await the completion of that work with entire confidence that it is progressing as rapidly as consistent with proper thoroughness and that it will amply justify all of the time and expense which it entails. We believe that the value of the work, when completed, will be so great and so evident as to leave remaining no single doubt as to the expediency of maintaining it as a permanent function of the Government for the benefit of all the people.

It will be recalled that this investigation was made by the representatives of the greatest commercial body in this country, if not in the whole world, intensely interested in having this work on which the future prosperity of the whole country was so dependent, accurately and well done; that it especially requested the President to permit them to make this investigation of the work of the Tariff Board, and the manner in which this committee was received and the opportunities offered for investigation are set forth in the report above quoted.

This, then, is the estimate of the Tariff Board by this intelligent and nonpartisan commission which officially represents the manufacturing industry of the entire country, after a thorough investigation of its work, and to which nothing can be added.

The Appropriations Committee undertook to inform itself as to the character and extent of the work performed by this board and summoned its members before it. The statements made by its chairman, Mr. Emery, were most instructive and show conclusively not only its method of procedure and accuracy, but also that the estimate made of the work of the Tariff Board by the National Tariff Commission committee is warranted in every particular.

I quote in part from the hearings:

Mr. EMERY. We have shown what rates would equalize the difference in the cost of production, but we have never in the way of a formal meeting for that purpose discussed at all the question of any tariff rate, either in the present tariff or in any proposed rates, with a view to determine what it should be.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, you have never undertaken to make any recommendations?

Mr. EMERY. Not in the slightest.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then your advisement of the President, under the law, has consisted in presenting to him certain information in the way of data, without giving any conclusions of the board in connection therewith?

Mr. EMERY. Absolutely.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do you consider that that represents the scope of the board's authority?

Mr. EMERY. Absolutely.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do you consider that that represents the scope it should have?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. In point of efficiency?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. After the President indicated the particular schedule he desired, was it left to be determined by the board?

Mr. EMERY. You mean as to the line of inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. EMERY. That has been left absolutely to the board. The President simply said, "Give me the information on this subject," and he left it to us to determine the whole line of inquiry. The President instructed us to find the absolute facts, so far as it was possible to do in relation to each industry, regarding prices, the relative cost of production here and abroad, the condition of competition between the American producer and the foreign producer, the relation between cost at home and the price charged at home, between the price charged by the manufacturer and the price charged to the consumer, and to report those facts fully and completely, whatever they were, regardless of who was affected by the publication of this knowledge. * * * We were to find out all we could about a given industry, and it was not to be prepared for use of any one person or for the use of a person who had a particular object in mind, but was to be prepared so that those facts would be as useful as possible either for Congress or for the President, either for a protectionist or a free trader to understand the existing conditions in the industry as it is.

Mr. MALBY. There are one or two questions that I would like to ask Mr. Emery. I did not, perhaps, quite understand the import of one or two questions asked by the chairman or by Mr. SHERLEY relative to the gathering of the detailed facts with respect to any industry, and, when collected, as to whether another body of men, rather than the present board, considering the same facts which you had before you, could in honesty and fairness come to any other conclusion with respect to cost than you did?

Mr. EMERY. No, sir; I do not believe it possible.

Mr. MALBY. That is to say, your findings are based upon the facts found by you in the course of your examination?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir; and I am confident that any five men who would check the data we had would come to the same conclusion that we came to with regard to cost.

Mr. MALBY. The thing I want to develop clearly for the record is that your conclusions were deduced from a certain state of facts ascertained by you after a careful, patient, and honest investigation?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir; our conclusions as to the facts.

Mr. MALBY. And in making your investigations in the various mills or manufacturing establishments, the commission had previously laid down certain rules and regulations for the guidance and direction of the employees of the commission, as to the scope and character of the investigation demanded?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MALBY. And these rules were uniform and applied to each one of the investigators sent out?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MALBY. Several European countries maintain boards having for their purpose the performing of functions somewhat similar to those performed by your board for the furnishing of tariff data?

Mr. EMERY. Many of them do. Practically all of them have a permanent body of officials studying the relation of the tariff to industries. Japan has just established a new permanent tariff commission.

Mr. MALBY. And the boards in these countries are permanent organizations?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir; they have nothing to do with politics and go on from year to year.

The foregoing questions and answers clearly indicate the attitude of the President with reference to the board and its work, as well as the fact that the board confined its investigations to the ascertainment of legitimate facts connected with the industries under investigation, regardless of results.

The work of the board, in addition to the investigation of the foreign tariff, has been divided into two different branches of inquiry—first, the preparation of reports, which have included analyses of existing tariff schedules, with a description of each article, its character, and its place in the industry, together with all the necessary statistical, descriptive, and historical material regarding each article necessary for tariff purposes; second, much more elaborate reports involving an investigation through expert agents of the board into the cost of production here and abroad, together with a large mass of information as to the conditions of competition between this and other countries. These reports have been much more elaborate and difficult and have involved the use of a very much larger force of experts. Under the reports of the first character referred to above the board has completed reports on Schedule A, chemicals; Schedule B, pottery and earthenware; Schedule I, cotton; Schedule K, wool and manufactures of. It has partially completed reports on Schedule C, iron and steel; Schedule E, sugar; Schedule J, jute and linen; Schedule L, silk and manufactures of; and Schedule N, leather. Under the second class of reports the board has completed Schedule I, cotton; Schedule K, wool and manufactures of; Schedule M, pulp and paper; and also a report on the relative value of farm products in Canada and the United States.

All the findings of facts reported are unanimously agreed to, indicating conclusively the nonpartisan character of the work of the board.

Attention is called to the fact that this work is not simply for the information of Congress, but for the whole country, for both the manufacturer and consumer alike, and so far as it has already been published it has shown by the unanimous testimony of both importers and dealers on the one hand and manufacturers on the other, that the investigation was practical and thorough and reveals the real facts regarding the conditions of the respective industries.

Furthermore, by the testimony of one, at least, of the leading experts in Europe this Tariff Board has been able during its brief existence to put itself at the head of all similar bodies in the entire world.

I quote as follows from Mr. Richard Schuller, a distinguished member of the Austrian tariff board of more than 20 years' service:

ROYAL IMPERIAL MINISTRY OF COMMERCE,
Vienna, March 18, 1912.

* * * It (the wool report) is an excellent standard work. The Tariff Board has come within a very short time to the head of all the similar boards established a long time since in the other countries. It is really true that no legislative body has ever had presented to it a better report on a tariff question. It will be also entirely impossible not to take your results in mind in proceeding to a revision of the tariff. It was a great mistake to stop the work of the board, and it would soon prove necessary to reestablish it.

RICHARD SCHULLER.

It will be seen that although reports have been completed upon only three schedules the work has progressed so far upon others that to discontinue it at the present time would be to stop it when it is only about half completed and thus lose the benefits of the work already done and paid for, and at a time when contemplated tariff legislation makes its continuance most necessary and desirable.

Preliminary work has been done, as we have seen, on a good many schedules. The methods of investigation have been tried out and thoroughly tested. An experienced force has been organized, and the work on the remaining schedules is far less complicated than that on the woolen and cotton schedules, which have already been completed. As a result, these schedules can be completed much more rapidly than when the work was in the first experimental stages. Bills have, so far, passed one or both Houses of Congress affecting the cotton schedule, the woolen schedule, chemical, and paper and pulp schedules, sugar and iron and steel schedules, reports on all of which have been submitted by the Tariff Board except on the iron and steel and sugar schedules. An investigation of the sugar schedule is now under way, and preliminary work has been done on this as well as on the metal schedule, and in view of the action taken by the House and the Senate on the sugar schedule its importance to Congress and the country can not be overestimated.

The entire work of the Tariff Board could probably be completed within the next two or three years and kept up to date thereafter with a very small force of employees and at a small expense.

It may be said, then, that there is no sound basis for the objection to the continuance of the work of the Tariff Board, and there are reasons without number why it should be continued. I submit that the labor which has been performed so faithfully and well and upon such a high plane as this merits more consideration than that a great committee, holding the purse strings of the Government, should simply dismiss it without an appropriation at all, locked up and left to starve. I do not want to be unkind in my remarks, and I probably could not if I wanted to, but it strikes me that failing to make an appropriation for the Tariff Board is consistent and in strict conformity with their determination to stop all avenues of information which lead to true light. When you are making a tariff bill the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee are told to keep away; the country is told that it is none of their business; and by refusing a reasonable appropriation to carry on the Tariff Board you have said to the country that the Democracy prefers darkness rather than light. [Applause.]

I read over a portion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD], made the other day, and his criticisms of the Tariff Board seemed to be based upon his unsupported charge that the report of the Tariff Board on the cotton schedule did not, according to his idea, contain evidence of its absolute correctness. Perhaps it is not absolutely correct in every particular, but had he treated the report fairly, as did the Tariff Board in making it in a nonpartisan manner, his conclusions undoubtedly would have been different. I believe that the people of this country will accept the judgment of those who have examined and approved of it as a business proposition rather than political, than to adopt the statement from one who advocates a tariff for revenue only and not for protection. As an evidence of the correctness of their reports let me call attention to the fact that a company which was doing an \$8,000,000 business was examined by the board, which proceeded to estimate by the use of its tables of costs the actual total cost of manufacture for the year to the company. The figures checked within \$8.33 of the total amount of money expended by the company in manufacture during the year for which the Tariff Board made the estimate. In another case, by the same method of computation, the variation amounted to only \$332. In every case the report shows that the companies examined agree, after a careful examination, that the figures given by the Tariff Board in its report on the cotton

schedule, and the cost of manufacture, and so forth, are correct. In the face of these facts the country will determine whether my colleague from New York [Mr. REDFIELD] is correct in his criticisms or whether the findings of the Tariff Board are for all practical purposes absolutely correct.

Our Democratic friends will have to find some other excuse for not continuing this board than that they are incompetent, or that the country does not want them, or that the task which has been assigned to them is an impossible one.

I believe that too high a tariff, one in excess of the difference in cost of production here and abroad, is unjust to the consumer, and one lower is unjust to the manufacturer and laborer. A tariff representing less than the difference in cost would invariably result in either lowering the wages of the employee to the point where the cost at home and abroad would again have to be equalized or the importation of foreign-made goods would be inevitable, bringing about the complete destruction of our home industries, for a tariff which does not equal the difference between the cost at home and abroad is no better than no tariff at all so far as the effect upon our protected industries is concerned, for the results would be the same in either case.

It matters very little to a 6-foot man whether he is thrown into 7 feet of water a thousand miles from shore, or whether he went down with the *Titanic* 10,000 feet below the surface of the sea, for the one in the 7 feet of water might struggle for a while, but in the end he must necessarily yield to the inevitable and find his resting place beneath the waves.

Why shut out the light when the information is at hand and the demand well-nigh universal? Can the Democracy, who are now in control of the purse strings of the National Treasury, find justification in the cry of economy, which is seldom practiced by them and so often neglected when the public interest would be promoted by its observance? Hundreds of thousands of dollars have already been appropriated and expended by them, hundreds of thousands more have been authorized to be expended, since they came into power in this House about a year ago, in a perfect multitude of investigations, and without one single tangible reform or economy resulting therefrom. Can they now afford to refuse a moderate appropriation to continue the work of the Tariff Board, which is so much needed and demanded by the people of the whole country outside of these legislative halls in correctly solving this great national question of tariff legislation, and which is so highly appreciated both at home and abroad? Upon them rests the responsibility for the success or failure of this appropriation. You may succeed in temporarily shutting off the light, but enough has already been seen by the people of this country to convince them of the utility and necessity for this information, and when the Republican Party is restored to power in November the good work will be completed and tariff bills formulated along those lines which will, as in the beginning, serve to support the Government and protect our manufactures and their employees from that competition from other lands which would reduce their pleasant and happy homes to hovels and turn their holidays to drudgery. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] 30 minutes.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the House and particularly of the committee which reported this bill, because if I do not get their attention the people in my district and my State are going to suffer a great injury.

There are about seven large national parks in the West. The Mount Rainier National Park will, I think, be conceded by all to be of equal importance with that of any other park. In point of attendance of visitors it ranked third last year, and if the Government road in the park through the reserve, to which I am going to address my attention, is maintained, it is only a question of one or two years when in point of visitors the Mount Rainier National Park will exceed that of any of these national parks.

It is one of the most beautiful natural parks in the world; it surrounds one of the grandest mountains in the world. There is not a stretch of mountains in Switzerland that affords more beautiful or magnificent scenery than that contained in the Mount Rainier National Park which surrounds Mount Tacoma.

The Government established this park a number of years ago. Shortly afterwards it determined to construct a road within it. An appropriation was made to that end. The Government engineers went to the park and commenced surveying a road up the side of the mountain from a point that is known as the Hot Springs. After the Government had spent much time in surveying this road it finally located one from the Hot Springs up the mountain side to the eternal snows, at a grade of 4

per cent. The road as located, in point of engineering feat, is equal to that of any road constructed in the United States, and when completed no other mountain road in this country or in Switzerland will surpass it in point of scenery. No transcontinental road that has been constructed across the Rocky Mountains displays better engineering skill than this mountain road. The engineers then undertook to locate a road from Hot Springs in the park to connect the proposed Government road, as mentioned, with the county road of Pierce County at the edge of Mount Rainier National Forest Reserve.

Several years before the park was established and before the Government had extended its surveys up to and into the boundaries of the park some settlers had squatted along the Nisqually River. Each settler took up a quarter section along the line of this river up to what is now the boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park. After considerable surveying the Government engineers found that the shortest and most direct route for the proposed road to connect with the county road and one that would cost the least to build and at the same time give the Government the grade it desired was over the land of these settlers. For these reasons the Government decided to locate the road on this line and solicited the settlers to grant a right of way over their land. The settlers deeded to the Government the right of way over their land. Prior to this time these settlers and the county of Pierce had constructed a road that was sufficient for all purposes for the settlers. The Government also asked the county of Pierce to consent to the construction of the proposed Government road, as it crossed and recrossed the county road in a number of places. If the Government had built this road upon its own land, the road would have been nearly twice as long and in every way less desirable.

The objection that the members of the committee have made to the appropriation is based on the grounds that the Government ought not to construct a road on private property. They overlook the fact that this road was located and constructed by the Government over the land of these settlers not for the benefit of the settlers in any wise, but for the benefit of the Government, in order that it might secure a right for the grade it desired and also save much in cost of construction of the road. The road through the forest reserve is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long. The road through the reserve, as constructed, runs in a generally easterly direction. The Government owns forest land on either side of this $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles of road through the forest reserve. It is the very choicest of timberland. It is of immense value. The timber that the Government owns on either side of this road for 10 miles back is easily worth many, many millions of dollars, all of which is nonassessable and from which the county of Pierce and State of Washington get not a penny of taxes.

The tax on the forest land at the rate and on the valuation given like timberland in Pierce County for 10 miles on either side in one year would more than macadamize this road.

The road as originally constructed was sufficient for the travel for the first two or three years the park was open, but the travel has increased enormously during the past two years, and, in addition to that, it has been used by the purchasers of timber from the Government in hauling out lumber and shingles that have been manufactured on Government land. A mill has been built and the Government is getting a large amount each year from the sale of timber, which is hauled over the entire length of this $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles of road. This is hard hauling, and during the rainy months of the last winter season has practically destroyed the road.

If the road is not improved as I suggest, no one will be able to enter the park this year except on foot, and the Government will lose the revenue both from the people who enter the park and the sale of its timber.

Congressmen SULZER and MURDOCK were over this road last fall. They will tell you the frightful condition it was in then, but it is far worse now by reason of the heavy hauling which I have mentioned. I informed the Commercial Club of Tacoma in March that it was possible that the committee would not make any recommendation for an appropriation for this road. This aroused the people of the whole State of Washington, and they have deluged me with telegrams showing the frightful condition of the road and the urgent need of an appropriation.

I will read you a few of these telegrams and print as a part of my remarks many others:

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Immediate financial aid must be given to repairing Mount Tacoma Road within Rainier Forest Reserve or success mountain season impossible. Road worse condition this season than ever; cut up by unusually heavy hauling. Pierce County hitherto made repairs. Government should make adequate repairs and improvements.

TACOMA DAILY LEDGER.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Would not be destroyed every year by ordinary hauling. We do not feel that Pierce County should be called upon every year to repair the road through Government property. Please do your best to secure appropriation for substantial and permanent repairs.

TORGER PETERSON,
Chairman Board Pierce County Commissioners.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The many thousands of tourists who will visit this section the coming season will be disappointed in their efforts to visit and see the beauties of the wonderful Mount Rainier National Park, because the condition of the road through the forest reserve extending to the limits of the park make the latter absolutely inaccessible at present.

THE TACOMA TRIBUNE,
J. E. RHODES, Publisher.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Road to Mount Rainier almost impassable within the limits of the forest reserve without a good road in the reserve; the road building which has been done in the park will not be of much use, as no one can reach it; respectfully urge immediate improvement.

H. R. WILLIAMS,
President C. M. & P. S. Ry.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Tacoma Municipal Commission to-day passed following resolution:
"Whereas condition Government road through forest reserve is in deplorable and almost impassable condition; and
"Whereas tourist season is approaching when large numbers of people will visit park: be it

"Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress be, and are hereby, urged to use best endeavors to have Government put said road in good condition at earliest possible date."

W. W. SEYMOUR, Mayor.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Bottom dropped out Government road in national forest. Bottom will drop out tourist travel to mountain unless road is fixed quick. Pierce County gone limit in assistance to mountain road. Feels Government should complete work. Please use your best efforts in Congress for right kind of assistance.

H. C. NUTT.

There is no way to enter the park except through this Government road. All the travel into the park is over this road. It can be reached in no other way. Last year over 10,000 people went in over this road in a space of about 45 days.

It is expected by those who operate the hotels and camps in the park that the travel into the park this year would be from 15,000 to 20,000 people. If this road is not made passable not 500 people will be able to enter the park. Last year the Government received \$8,000 from licenses, and so forth, from people who entered the park over this road. This year it would take in from this source from \$12,000 to \$15,000, if this road is improved as I suggest. If the road is not improved as I suggest the Government will lose not less than \$10,000 to \$15,000, which it ought to have and which would enable the Government to make still further improvements in the park. The mill corporation which is purchasing timber from the Government will have to close down and go out of business unless this road is improved. The Government will lose from this source \$10,000 and upward each year. So, if you look at it strictly from a business point of view it is wholly indefensible to refuse the appropriation. It will not only prevent people from using this park as they desire to, and ought to be permitted to, but the Government will lose an income this coming year of not less than \$20,000. So I ask this appropriation not alone because it is just and right that we have it, but because it would be a pecuniary loss to the Government itself. This appropriation can not be refused, then, on the ground of economy; it can not be refused because people do not make use of the park, as I will shortly show.

MR. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. CULLOP). Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

MR. WARBURTON. Yes; I will.

MR. PAGE. My recollection is, as a member of the committee, that the gentleman introduced a bill and appeared, I believe, before the subcommittee and asked for an appropriation of \$30,000 for the construction of this road?

MR. WARBURTON. Yes.

MR. PAGE. Is this proposed road inside or outside of the national park?

MR. WARBURTON. It is within the forest reserve. It is part of a national park road.

MR. PAGE. That is my recollection of the testimony taken before the committee, and it is also my recollection that within this 3 miles of forest road which is sought to be improved the

land has been preempted and is in private possession and does not belong to the Government, in spite of the fact that it is included within the bounds of a forest reserve; and the gentleman in point of fact is asking the Committee on Appropriations, or did ask the Committee on Appropriations, and proposes to ask the House, to appropriate \$30,000 to build a road over private property.

Mr. WARBURTON. I went over that a moment ago, and I am glad to go over it again. Now, I want the gentleman's attention—

Mr. PAGE. I am listening to the gentleman.

Mr. WARBURTON. I want to call your attention to this map of the State of Washington which discloses the location of the Rainier National Forest Reserve and the Mount Rainier National Park, which you will observe is wholly within the forest reserve. The road constructed by Pierce County through the forest reserve is along this general line [pointing to map] touching the forest reserve at about this point. You will observe the road through the forest reserve extends about 3½ miles through the reserve before it reaches the park. It will be remembered this road was built by the Government to make the national park accessible and is, in fact, an integral part of the national park road. You will observe by looking at the map that the land lying immediately north and south of this road for many miles is in the forest reserve and, I will say, is the choicest land.

You will readily understand how unfair it would be to ask the State of Washington to construct a mountain road through this park for the benefit of the Government. If the Government is going to own and use this property and sell it and get the benefit of it, it ought, in all fairness, to construct the road. The Mount Rainier Forest Reserve, together with the Mount Rainier National Park, have an area of over 2,800 square miles. Together they are nearly three times as large as the State of Rhode Island, over half as large as the State of Maryland, and one-third as large as the State of Massachusetts or New Jersey. They contain over 2,800 sections of land. The road through the forest reserve runs over about five quarter sections of land lying practically end to end or about 1½ square miles out of this over 2,800 square miles.

Now, you are suggesting that Pierce County and the State of Washington, because one twenty-eighth hundredth part of it is privately owned, construct 3 miles of expensive macadamized road, which is a part of the park road and which is through Government land.

This land within the park reserve is the most valuable land in the State of Washington. It is worth more than a like area of farm lands either in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or Connecticut, or Maryland, improved as they are.

This 1,800,000 acres of land would sell on the market tomorrow for more than a like number of acres in any of the States I have mentioned, outside of the towns and municipalities. You have some idea of what the taxes would be derived from this land if owned privately. If the Government is going to continue to hold this land and ultimately sell the timber thereon and take the proceeds, it certainly is nothing but fair that it should repair a necessary road for the benefit of the people who go to the national park and necessarily have to pass over the road.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman consider the park a benefit to the community?

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly; I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. You consider it also a benefit to the community to have people visiting the park?

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then by what process of reasoning do you make the burden of maintaining all of the roads and the tax to build roads that confer a benefit upon the State and the community fall upon the United States Government?

Mr. WARBURTON. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question, and I will come to that in a few moments. Pierce County and the State of Washington have done something for the park that no other part of the country has done. It has done more than any other county, State, or country has done. Where this road enters the park it is 50 miles from the city of Tacoma. We needed no roads except the ones we had already constructed, except for a fine road to the park. In the last five years Pierce County has built a road solely for the purpose of this park that cost between \$250,000 and \$300,000 in cash. When this season opens in July every mile of that road that needs macadamizing or paving will be paved or macadamized. We are spending \$50,000 this spring to finish macadamizing the last of that 50 miles of road.

Mr. PAGE. The gentleman made the statement that the county in which Tacoma is located and that is adjacent to this

park had done for the national park what no other community had done.

Mr. WARBURTON. That is correct.

Mr. PAGE. Does the gentleman seriously mean that his county has expended this \$200,000 in the construction of a macadamized road from the edge of this forest reservation for the benefit of the park?

Mr. WARBURTON. Absolutely for the benefit of the park and the resultant benefit by the people using the park, and they come from all parts of the United States.

Mr. PAGE. Let me ask the gentleman, on the other hand, was not that road constructed by the county or by the city of Tacoma for the benefit that would come to the county and city of Tacoma because of the road and the number of people who would come there to visit the park?

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly so; but we are the only county I know of that has built a macadamized road to a park 50 miles away, and I think that when we spend \$5 to the Government's \$1 in making the road, at least we ought to be treated as well as you treat any other park. You have not done that. You gave \$50,000 to Glacier Park this year.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman assumes that the building of that road over private property was the result of a great deal of magnanimity on the part of the people who owned the ground. In point of fact, I have never known a community on earth that would not be perfectly willing to give the ground for building a road that would produce the advantages to the community that this road did. Now, the gentleman's argument is like that of every gentleman that has a Government institution within the boundaries of his district—that whenever it comes to the burden of the institution they say Uncle Sam should bear it because it is national, and whenever it comes to the benefits they want them all.

Mr. WARBURTON. I do not do that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to suggest another thing. The gentleman is aware that there is a provision carried in the Agriculture appropriation bill for the building of roads through forest reserves. Why should we appropriate for parks and for building roads through forest reserves or through private property?

Mr. WARBURTON. One amendment I am going to offer, which is desired by the Agricultural Department and the Secretary of the Interior, that this road be made a part of it.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is desired by the Agricultural Department, of course, to come and get out of Congress all the money it can for building roads and then turn over to some other bureau all it can so as to have that much more money.

Mr. WARBURTON. I may be dull of comprehension, but I know the conditions out there, and I know that if we had the assessed value of that land on either side of this forest reserve for one single year in taxes we could get enough out of it to macadamize the road. If we were getting the taxes out of it, I would say let the people build the road, but we are not.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that the local authorities have built a road up to within 3 miles of the park?

Mr. WARBURTON. Up to the edge of the forest reserve.

Mr. MANN. Between the end of the road is a part of the forest reserve?

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And the Agricultural Department has jurisdiction over it?

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman made any effort to have that provision put in the Agriculture appropriation bill?

Mr. WARBURTON. I did, over in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. There is not much satisfaction in being in the fix that the gentleman is where he has a road built up to one point and built up to another and having a quarrel over the space in between.

Mr. WARBURTON. There has never been one before this time.

Mr. MANN. But there has been no road there.

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes; the Government has already constructed the road, but it has become impassable.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman state how much land is owned privately on each side, immediately on either side?

Mr. WARBURTON. Within 5 miles on either side there is not one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not the road over ground that was originally privately owned?

Mr. WARBURTON. There is no private land on the left of the road or on the right of it; it is all Government land. Here is one—

Mr. SHERLEY. But it goes over property privately owned?

Mr. WARBURTON. It runs over about five quarter sections lying along the river. Now, on either side of these quarter sections for 20 miles is Government property. Now, if we had 5 miles of private property on either side of the road, we would construct the road. But the Government owns it for 10 to 50 miles on either side, and if we owned property for 10 miles on either side we could pave the road with the taxes that would come from it in one year.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to get at the facts, because I can not carry in my mind all the items relating to these different projects. Is it not a fact that the road itself—I am not talking about quarter sections, but the road itself—is built over mostly privately owned property?

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes; but the right of way has been ceded the Government.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not a fact that at the present time alongside the most of the road is privately owned property?

Mr. WARBURTON. There is just that one succession of quarter sections, as I state. The property beyond that on either side is not privately owned.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am talking about property right next to the road.

Mr. WARBURTON. Suppose this [pointing to the desk] was a forest reservation, and suppose by some accident four or five quarter sections of land extended into it and the Government needed a road which it desired for the public, would the gentleman ask us to build the road?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Referring to where the road is, whether on private property or not, can the State build the road over this property?

Mr. WARBURTON. No.

Mr. MANN. Why not?

Mr. WARBURTON. Because it is Government-owned property. The Government wants to keep the road so as to be able to protect the forest reserve and also the park. I have letters from the Secretary stating that it is desired to have it placed under the jurisdiction of the park in order to police it and as a matter of fire protection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the first question which would arise, it seems to me, would be whether it is properly the duty of the General Government to build the road or properly the duty of the local authorities to build the road. If it should be determined that it is the duty of the General Government, in the interest of the General Government, to build the road, of course it does not make much difference whether it is forest reserve or private property. But if the local authorities ought to build the road, we could very easily grant them permission to do it.

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what I was going to add. Has the gentleman ever asked for permission?

Mr. WARBURTON. I have not.

Mr. SHERLEY. Are the people the gentleman represents willing now to undertake the building of it?

Mr. WARBURTON. No; I do not think so. I am going to appeal to this House and ask them if they think it fair that we should do it. I do not think it is fair.

Mr. MANN. After all, there is quite a question of principle involved. Here is a national park that it is to the interest of the Government to make available and entertaining for visitors. On the other hand, visitors who go to the park are a distinct financial advantage to the residents of the locality.

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And the question is whether the Government ought to construct the roads outside of the park in order to induce visitors to go there or whether the local people ought to build the road outside of the park and let the Government use its funds to construct a road inside the park. A great deal more is involved than this mere proposition, because that applies to all parks.

Mr. WARBURTON. I agree with the gentleman absolutely, where it is clearly outside of the Government property. For instance, if there was a place a mile wide or 2 miles wide, privately owned property, so that you could tax it and make the owners pay, all well and good, but it is essentially through Government property.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman speaks of local property. Of course it is certain that in this case, for instance, the privately owned property can not build the road, but that applies to almost every case where you want to build a first-class road. The question is whether it is the duty of the State to help build the road, whether it is to the interest of the State to make it easily accessible for visitors to reach this park, which, as the gentleman says, is one of the ornaments of the Nation,

and invite visitors to go there and spend their money in the State in that way, rather than to leave it inaccessible.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, further, that we are in very great need of money for widening the road within the park. The road is dangerous. I took President Taft over the road last year and was very severely criticized for it by all of the eastern papers, as some gentlemen will remember, because it was said by using this road we were endangering the life of the President. That park will be closed this year unless something is done immediately.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman wants my opinion, I think our present park system is entirely a mistake. The gentleman told the whole story a moment ago when he referred to the railroads advertising. The park is advertised simply by a railroad in order to help that railroad. Here a railroad comes to it. Then there are circulars and folders sent out to exploit that place that they may get the benefit of the railroad traffic. Then certain hotels, certain men running a line of busses, or certain automobile owners proceed also to boost that particular park that they may get the benefit of the travel which may come in. Now, what is the result? The result is to-day we are spending an altogether disproportionate sum of money on our national parks considering the resultant benefits to the Government and the American people. Last year the Yellowstone Park had 23,000 visitors during the year. Why, on one Sunday more people will go out to the Zoo Park outside of Washington here than will go throughout the entire year or through three years of the park which the gentleman is talking about; and what I am in favor of and what I am going to offer on the floor of this House is a provision by which we will charge a fee, not for the running of busses or automobiles, but a fee from every person who goes into the park; not a fee sufficient to bear all the burden of maintaining the park, but a fee that will bear part of the burden, in order that these peculiar beneficiaries of the national parks may bear some burden instead of the rest of the people.

Mr. WARBURTON. I do not disagree with the gentleman.

A MEMBER. How large a fee?

Mr. SHERLEY. My own idea is the fee ought to be at least a dollar a head. For instance, in the Yellowstone Park we would not keep a single man from going there and it would give \$23,000 more money to put on the roads. At present our system is without uniformity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WARBURTON. I would like to have more time.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. WARBURTON. I do not know; it depends upon how much I can obtain.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. WARBURTON. I agree with you. I am perfectly willing that they should be charged a dollar a head. Now, I have here a picture of this road, the one I want repaired. The Government has built 11 miles of roads in the reserve and park that it permits automobiles to use. Six hundred automobiles entered the park last year, and for the use of that road and this kind of a road they paid \$5 for each automobile. It is such a road that when I took Congressman SULZER and Congressman MURDOCK up there I could hardly force a 60-horsepower car through it. It is a road that is not fit to drive a drove of razorback hogs over.

Mr. SHERLEY. They not only pay the \$5 for going over the razorback-hog road of which the gentleman speaks, but they also pay it for the privilege of going over the other roads in the parks.

Mr. WARBURTON. In other words, they pay \$5 for riding over a Government road 11 miles and return. I say if you are going to charge us \$5 for the privilege of riding over a road that you ought to give us something that we can drive over.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the equity of the thing is that every dollar of this is turned back into improvements.

Mr. WARBURTON. If this road was built you would get out of it, instead of an income of \$8,000, an income of \$15,000 or \$20,000.

If you will give us a road in the reserve and park equal to the road we have constructed for 50 miles, instead of 10, we will have 50,000 or 60,000 people within the next three years, because it is the most attractive road in the world. It is the only road in the world where you can leave tidewater and go to the eternal snows in five hours' time. I have here 50 telegrams—telegrams from men like the president and vice president of the Milwaukee road, the Northern Pacific road, from every club in the State of Washington, from every organization of any character that is organized for promoting the interest of the country in which it is located—urging the appropriation. There is not a dollar of money requested by any locality that has been

granted it or will be granted that is needed as much as this appropriation. I do not think there is a locality which has the benefit of a park in its community that has done one-half of what my country has done toward improving a road to the park and making it accessible. Last year we spent \$50,000 in macadamizing this road. This year we are spending another \$50,000 in macadamizing the road, and it does not seem like it is much to ask the Government much more to put \$30,000 on the end of it on its own property and its own reservation.

Now, the people, as I said, paid nearly \$8,000 last year for the use of this park. There was appropriated last year \$3,000. The Sequoia National Park last year, for which it is proposed to appropriate this year \$15,800, had total receipts of \$336 as against our \$8,000. You propose to appropriate \$50,000 for the Glacier National Park, and last year the receipts were something like \$780 against our \$8,000. This year you propose to appropriate for the Yellowstone \$75,500. Its receipts were \$23,000 as against our \$8,000. Now, I do not think we are asking anything but what is fair between man and man. I think it is a moral obligation that rests upon the Government to keep this road in repair. If it ultimately should develop that the Government wants to return this land to the county, all well and good. We will take the road and keep it in repair. But I will venture the assertion that that will not be done—that is, it will not be done unless over the protest of the Agricultural Department and the Department of the Interior. A number of them have told me, for instance, Assistant Secretary Thompson and a subordinate in the Agricultural Department, that it ought to remain in the control of the Government, because running through the park as it does and through the forest they want to control it and they want the power to police this road to prevent forest fires, and so forth, and they ought to have it. The Government has given the Yellowstone Park \$2,000,000 in the last 15 years. If so, I think it could give us \$35,000 to improve this road.

As I have stated, the people of my county have expended about \$300,000 in building a road to make the park accessible. I think we have actually spent five dollars in constructing a road to the park where one has been expended by the Government within it. We certainly have built 50 miles of splendid road, macadamized where needed, while the Government has constructed within the forest reserve and in the park less than 25 miles, and most of it is in a deplorable condition, the worst part being within the forest reserve, which is wholly impassable. If the Government would macadamize all the road within the forest reserve as well as within the park it then would have a road not at all superior to the Pierce County road as it now exists, and if this were done it would only be building a road equal to that of the county in quality and only one-third as long. I think when my county builds 3 miles of road to the park where the Government has built 1 mile in the park we have done our share. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WARBURTON. I will ask permission to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Can have photographs made showing bad condition of forest-reserve road and mail same Monday morning if they will reach you in time to be of service. Wire quick Saturday morning if these photographs will be of service; must have answer by noon Saturday; suggest you suspend activities on all mountain legislative matters except measure to repair forest-reserve road until we can send you complete recommendations joint Seattle-Tacoma committees. Superintendent Hall wrote Secretary Fisher, under date of 28th, describing horrible condition reserve road and urging prompt action to provide funds for repairs.

TACOMA COMMERCIAL CLUB.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Careless lumberjacks have ruined Mount Tacoma Road in forest reserve; vehicles sink in mire to hub; all rest of road in splendid shape; piece in reserve shame and disgrace. We believe Government should fix it, and will do so; earnestly urge you get situation to attention proper sources.

MAURICE A. LANGHORNE.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Jolting President Taft got last fall no circumstance to what tourists will get this year over mountain road in forest reserve. Anything you can do to secure funds to have this road put in condition will be highly appreciated by all Tacomans.

A. M. INGERSOLL.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Early visitors to Rainier National Park report road through forest reserve absolutely impassable; ruined by hauling of shingle bolts and lumber; urge you to greatest possible efforts in matter of securing funds to put this road in usable condition; quarter million dollars spent this city and county wasted unless this link of road is made passable.

WEST COAST GROCERY CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28-29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge you introduce emergency appropriation bill for construction competent road in Rainier Reserve; rest of mountain road built by city and county in splendid condition; road in reserve impassable account logging operations; immediate Federal assistance only way vehicles can reach mountain coming season.

TACOMA GRAIN CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 30, 1912.

Congressman STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly solicit your cooperation securing passage bill providing \$45,000 emergency appropriation for immediate improvement road leading terminus Pierce County road through Government forest reserve. This road is in absolute deplorable condition, demanding immediate repair. Prompt action on part of Government now will prove a saving to department.

TACOMA AUTO CLUB.

ASHFORD, WASH., February 23, 1912.

STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

My estimate to widen fifteen and macadamize thirty-five thousand. Engineer Keys estimates forty-five thousand. See his report to Secretary of Interior. Arrangements can probably be made for rock from county plant. This portion of Government road now practically impassable.

HALL, Superintendent.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29-30, 1912.

STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Rotary Club of Tacoma, representing over 1,000 distinct lines of business, urge immediate appropriation for repair of road through Rainier Forest Reserve. Persons having timber lease from Government have been hauling shingle bolts over road during winter months and have rendered same impassable for ordinary traffic. Imperative that special provision be made for repair of road to provide access to the park for summer traffic.

W. CARR MORROW, President.
W. G. STEARNS, Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House, Washington, D. C.:

Absolutely necessary to repair or reconstruct present road from end of Pierce County road to National Park Road before summer season opens. Road now practically impassable, due to heavy freighting of lumber and shingles over road during rainy season. Government responsible for this condition, therefore they should repair road.

SEATTLE COMMERCIAL CLUB.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Congressman STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

We find it practically impossible to drive an automobile through Government reserve road between Ashford and Rainier National Park entrance, account horrible condition of roadbed, which is like a hog mire. Please urge immediate action by Government.

TACOMA AUTO LIVERY CO.
By GEO. J. SCHARLER.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Tourists to Mount Tacoma will be absolutely unable to use present roadway unless some appropriation and help is secured from the Government to put in repair and proper condition the roadway from the reserve limits to the entrance to the national park. Heavy travel this winter has completely ruined the road, and condition needs urgent attention. Over 10,000 tourists entered the park last year and number increases largely every season. We urge you to bend every effort to secure necessary appropriation. We will appreciate your efforts.

PACIFIC CAR CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

On account of poor construction and heavy hauling over same by parties operating under Government timber contracts, road between outer boundary Rainier Forest Reserve and Park entrance is made impassable and dangerous for carriages and automobiles most of the year. Do all possible to obtain Government aid to rectify conditions.

J. M. KEEN.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge your cooperation and efforts to secure assistance from the Government to improve roadway from western limits Government forest reserve to entrance Mount Rainier National Park. Owing to heavy timber hauling during the past winter the road is

absolutely impassable at present, and it will be absolutely unfit for the heavy tourist travel to the mountain unless immediate steps are taken to improve this stretch of road; therefore prompt action is imperative. Will appreciate your efforts.

FIDELITY TRUST CO.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The present roadway from the entrance to the Mount Rainier National Park to the western end of the Government forest reserve is in a most deplorable condition. In order to make this stretch of road passable for this year's travel to the mountain immediate work for the betterment of this roadway must be begun. Can you not obtain an appropriation from the Government and impress upon them the necessity for immediate action? Will appreciate your efforts.

JOHN S. BAKER.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Mount Tacoma tourist travel will bang up against it unless road in national forest is fixed quick. Ten thousand persons visited mountain last year not one-quarter as many will go this year unless highway is improved. Do all you can to get Government aid to work.

SAVAGE SCOFIELD CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Do all you can to urge immediate appropriation for repairs to road Rainier Forest Reserve, which has been damaged by loggers operating under Government lease. In its present condition the road will be impassable for summer traffic.

Great golf weather these days.

DELBERT A. YOUNG.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28-29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Entire success 1912 mountain season depends on proper repair to Government road within Rainier Forest Reserve. Condition now worst imaginable, caused by hauling logs.

This road one causing great discomfort to President Taft on mountain trip last fall. Earnestly urge emergency appropriation.

SCANDINAVIAN AMERICAN BANK.

TACOMA, WASH., December 28-29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Condition Government road in national park awful. Immediate appropriation must be made or money spent by city and county on road in vain. Vehicle access to mountain next to impossible. I urge your best efforts for emergency appropriation. Park travel will be immense if repair is made.

ROBERT G. WALKER.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 2, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Seattle Ad Club urges the importance of appropriation to repair road in Rainier Reserve. Present condition makes its use impossible for coming season.

SEATTLE AD CLUB,
A. J. IZZARD, Secretary.

TACOMA, WASH., April 1-2, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Condition in forest reserve is such that unless macadamized before summer it will render national park almost inaccessible to vehicles. Hope your emergency bill passed promptly.

Your other bill appropriating \$150,000 for improving only the present South Side Road should be defeated unless amended to include Carbon River survey and construction of Indian Henry Road, to both of which Tacoma is committed by agreement with Seattle March 1. Amount asked for should be \$250,000.

JOHN H. WILLIAMS.

ABERDEEN, WASH., April 1.

STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your efforts to secure an appropriation from the Government for improvement of road extending from end of Pierce County Road, through the Government forest reserve, to the entrance of Rainier National Park, as a logging company has been hauling logs over this road during the winter until it is so badly cut up as to be almost impassable. Unless we can secure assistance from the Government, it will be almost impossible for tourist travel into the park this coming summer.

GRANIS HARBOR AUTO CLUB,
By W. J. PATTERSON, President.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge immediate appropriation for repair of road through Rainier Forest Reserve. Persons having timber leases from Government have been hauling shingle bolts over the road during winter months and have rendered same impassable for ordinary traffic; imperative that special provision be made for repair of road to provide access to the park for summer traffic.

HENRY MOHR.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you to use your best efforts to secure the necessary appropriation immediately to put in proper repair the Government road leading to the mountain before heavy traffic sets in. We must not disappoint the tourists.

W. R. MORSE.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28-29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our people all greatly interested in prospects of mountain travel this year. Have just learned condition of forest-reserve portion of road. Has been bad other seasons, but this year it is an utter wreck. Do all you can to get funds for repair.

TACOMA MILL CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28-29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Travel to Mount Tacoma almost impossible account awful condition portion of road in forest reserve. Entire success mountain travel this year depends early repair. Quarter million dollars spent by us total waste unless Government comes to rescue. Road ruined by heavy hauling. Urge your best endeavors for emergency appropriation.

JAMES H. DEGE CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge your best efforts in securing immediate Federal assistance to putting Mount Tacoma Road, in Rainier Forest Reserve, in good condition. Present state of road frightful. Hauling of lumber and shingle bolts cause money spent on road by city and county entirely wasted unless quick action is taken.

LISTER MANUFACTURING CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Rainier National Park had 2,000 visitors four years ago; 10,000 visitors last year. We are hoping for great increase. Condition of road through forest reserve ruins prospects unless immediately repaired. Do all you can to remedy the situation.

LOVE WARREN MONROE CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Mountain road in Rainier Reserve all shot to pieces. Nothing doing on tourist business unless fixed quick. Please get word situation to right spot.

CARMAN MANUFACTURING CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Over 10,000 tourists visited Mount Tacoma last year. No one could reach mountain now, account terrific condition road in national forest. Full success mountain exploitation depends on fixing this road. Emphatically urge emergency appropriation for building real road in reserve.

WALSH & GARDNER.

TACOMA, WASH.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred thousand dollars spent by Tacoma thrown to winds unless Government gets busy and fixes mountain road in national forest. Nobody can pass road now. Never has been a road, and Government should make it one. Your good offices in matter will be appreciated by everybody here.

TACOMA SMELTING CO.

TACOMA, WASH., April 1.

Congressman WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

The Government road to Rainier National Park has been damaged by logging company under Government lease. Will have to be repaired before summer travel starts. Use your best endeavors to secure an appropriation for this.

COMMERCIAL DOCK CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 29.

Hon. S. WARBURTON,
Washington, D. C.:

It has become absolutely necessary that immediate steps be taken to repair the Government road in Rainier National Park. Through the winter months heavy hauling of timber over a distance of 7 miles has almost destroyed the roadbed in places and rendered balance unfit for teams and auto travel.

FRANK A. NEYHART & CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

Hon. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

President Taft will bear witness awful condition of mountain road in national reserve. You ought to be able to get his active assistance for appropriation to make real road there. Suggest you see President and ask assistance. Careless logging methods have left road hub-deep mire. Whole country aroused.

CARSTENS PACKING CO.

TACOMA, WASH., March 28, 29, 1912.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Approach to Mount Tacoma utterly impossible now account bottomless road through national forest. Liberal support of Pierce County mountain road warrants Government in finishing it. Urge that you bring every possible pressure to bear to get something done at once.

PIONEER BINDERY & PRINTING CO.

TACOMA, WASH.

S. WARBURTON, Washington, D. C.:

Personally know that unless there is work done on forest reserve section of mountain road no person can visit Mount Rainier National Park this summer. Road absolutely impassable.

E. F. GREGORY.
JAS. R. THOMPSON.

TACOMA, WASH.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Mount Tacoma road to Rainier Reserve in absolutely rotten condition. Hauling logs made it utterly impassable. Quick action necessary or travel will be impossible. This strip one that bumped President Taft so hard. County done full share building road; Government should finish it.

E. B. JUDSON.

TACOMA, WASH.

HON. STANTON WARBURTON, M. C.,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Mountain road through national forest has never been more than a trail. Melting snows and early traffic this year have made it quagmire. Splendid assistance by Tacoma and Pierce County to construction rest of road warrants Government in building real road in reserve. Such road must be built or previous expenditures will be waste. Do all you can for emergency appropriation this work.

ST. PAUL & TACOMA LUMBER CO.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, at the request of my colleague, who has charge of the time on this side, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the debate here, and I can not help but think that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is inclined not to treat the people of the West with that degree of fairness which he would demand for his own State if one-fourth of his territory was taken up in forest reserves, Indian reservations, national parks, and things of that character.

As I sat here and heard him making his remarks regarding the railroad people taking an interest in this road-building question I thought that this is not entirely selfish on the part of those railroads. They have gone into that mountainous country at an expense of \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000, and sometimes \$100,000 a mile to build their roads. If this country was not taken up with Government reserves, if this was not a national park, if it was cut up into farms and homes as it ought to be, and there were thousands of people in there creating commerce for those railroads to carry, does not the gentleman think they would get more out of it than they would out of the passenger traffic they are now taking in there? And are not the railroads justified in asking that the Government make this property available for tourists, inasmuch as the Government has set it aside for a national park? I think the people of the West are making a very reasonable request in asking the Government to construct roads through its reservations. I have sat here in this House and I have heard Members get up and say that the forests of the country that are left should be reserved for the use and benefit of the entire people. We have thousands of acres of forest reserves set aside, and people in the East to-day are hoping and thinking that some day those forest reserves will be converted into cash that will go into the National Treasury and reduce to some extent the taxes of all the people. They are trying to hold all the minerals that are in the mountains, in so far as they still belong to the Government. You all want to get the benefit from that.

Mr. SHERLEY. To whom does that land belong?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It belongs to the people. I am not questioning that.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then why do you object to the people wanting to retain it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it is within the confines of the States of Washington or Oregon or Idaho and other Western States, and those States do not get the benefit of one cent of taxes on such property. The people in the State of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] are getting taxes from every acre of that State to help pay the local and State ex-

penses. You people in the East do not take into consideration the fact that an extraordinary burden is put upon the people who have Indian reservations, forest reserves, and national parks within their confines. All we want is to be treated with fairness.

Mr. SHERLEY. Virginia, of which my State was a part, gave to the Union a great deal of territory, so that the gentleman's story does not fit at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How many thousand acres of forest reserve have you in Kentucky?

Mr. SHERLEY. We have not any. I wish we had.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How many Indian reservations and how many national parks that you do not get any taxes from?

Mr. SHERLEY. But listen. Where did you get your title?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All titles come from the Government. The gentleman does not need to ask a question of that kind. There is no man here so obtuse as not to understand that all titles come from the Government. That is immaterial. It is not a question whether the Government has a right to set aside forest reserves, Indian reservations, and things of that kind, that the county and State can have no control over, but it is a question whether the Government should then compel the local community to build roads and keep them up in order to get to that property and get through it. I am talking not only of this national forest reserve, but of all kinds of Government reservations.

Mr. SHERLEY. In point of fact all titles do not come from the Government. The title of the Government came from the States in my part of the country, and in parts of the great Northwest that Virginia ceded to the United States. You would not have had the Northwest under the Stars and Stripes if it had not been for the Kentuckians who explored it and gave it to the Union.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That may be in part true.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman ought not to talk about getting title from the Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The gentleman invited it by his question. When was Kentucky made a State; when did you get your title to the land in Kentucky? Did you acquire it from the Crown; did the United States get it?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman had read the compact with Virginia, he would not ask the question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have read all of that.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then the gentleman has forgotten it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I say Kentucky as a State never ceded anything to the National Government that she got from the Crown. All title has to come from the Government that was not acquired from the Crown.

If Kentucky received part of its territory from Virginia and through Virginia from the Crown, it was from Government just the same even though of Virginia and the Crown, and makes no difference in this controversy as to the right and expediency of the Government of the United States setting aside within the confines of any State of the Union national parks, forest reserves, and Indian reservations, and making inadequate or no provision at all for proper roads through these reservations. Granting that the Government has the power, is it just and right?

All we want is fair play. It is all any country in the West asks. When you set aside one-half or one-third or one-quarter of the territory in any State as reserves you should at least be willing to take care of the territory so set aside by constructing proper roads.

Mr. CANNON. There are a number of other gentlemen on this side who desire to be heard, but they are not present, and I take it they have abandoned their desire.

[Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MANN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CULLOP, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE were given leave to extend remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and of the subcommittee having in charge the preparation of this bill and reporting it to the House, I at the time it was reported had no purpose of submitting any remarks in the time allotted for general debate. I had hoped that the time might be limited to the least possible amount and that the bill might be brought to consideration under the five-minute rule and, as promptly as possible, passed through this House.

I have not been one of those who during the last few weeks have entertained even the hope that the Congress might complete its labors and adjourn by the middle of this month, and yet I had hoped that the necessary legislation of the session might be as speedily enacted as possible. I was somewhat disappointed on yesterday when it was demonstrated by a roll

call that there were not as many gentlemen in the House anxious to finish the business and adjourn as I had hoped. Quite a number of them put themselves on record as opposed to the consideration of the appropriation bills and preferred rather to take the time in discussing and passing other matters.

I should not, as I said in the beginning, have spoken on the bill at all but for certain developments during the debate upon the bill. In the opening remarks the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], made a very full and, I think to the membership of the House, a satisfactory explanation of the items carried in the bill, of the amounts that it carried, and a complete justification of the reduction in the amount carried in this bill as compared with the current law.

I desire to say, as a member of that committee, that individually and for the majority of the committee reporting this bill we assume full responsibility for the appropriations, item by item, carried in the bill for the maintenance of the several branches of the Government during the coming fiscal year.

I go further than that, Mr. Chairman, and make the statement that I do not believe in the face of the great reductions that have been made in the volume of appropriations ordinarily carried in the bill that any single department in this Government will suffer one iota in its efficiency for the lack of a proper amount of money to carry on the bureau or the department for which it was appropriated.

On yesterday the distinguished leader of the minority, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], seemed impatient that the Appropriation Committee had delayed reporting this bill to the House for so long a time. I am sure that the gentleman forgot that the appropriations for the affairs of the National Government had been for 16 years in the hands of the Republican Party, and that the people having commissioned what had been the minority party during this period to legislate and appropriate for the maintenance of the Government, we felt it was incumbent upon us to go into and examine more fully than has ordinarily been necessary or has ordinarily been done, the various items that go to make up the appropriations carried in this great bill. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations charged with this responsibility has gone not only fully but extensively into the examination of Government officials and others who are responsible for the estimates submitted to the Congress in which they ask appropriations. I dare say, whether we have wisely investigated or otherwise, that so full an investigation of the estimates and of the necessities of the various departments that are appropriated for in the bill has not been undertaken by any committee in this House for 20 years, and I venture the assertion that so valuable information touching the administration of the various bureaus and departments for which we appropriate has not heretofore been placed in the records of this House.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], my colleague upon the committee and upon the subcommittee, the former Speaker of this House, a native of my own State, the most distinguished Member of this House, made a speech upon this bill a day or two ago, and in the course of his remarks assumed a position that is remarkable to some of us as coming from the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have had great admiration for the courage of the gentleman from Illinois. He has been a stalwart of the stalwarts. He has stood in this House as a stone wall for 30 years, yea, more than that, for nearly 40 years, and has contended that the legislative branch of this Government should not be encroached upon by the executive branch. I do not believe that in the history of the Congress of the United States this body has had a more insistent or abler defender than the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.] Personally I have admired his persistence in this direction, and it is surprising, it is amazing, to some of us that after all these years he should at this late day in his long and illustrious career in this House surrender the position that he has occupied through all of these years and virtually say upon the floor of this House, in his criticism of items carried in the bill, that the majority is guilty, as he says, of sins of omission, in leaving out certain things which, in his judgment, should have gone in the bill. He cited item after item and made the statement that the estimate was so much, that the committee had allowed so much, and that he thought the estimates should have been allowed in full. Mr. Chairman, that is equivalent to saying that the gentleman from Illinois now believes the executive department of this Government should, in its estimates to this House, write into the law the amount of the appropriations for the various departments of the Government.

I can not believe that he really thinks this should be done, that the functions of the House of Representatives, the pre-

rogatives that have been given it by the Constitution, which he has defended through all of these years, should be abrogated to the various departments of the executive branch of the Government. [Applause.] Yet this is the logical conclusion that one must reach from the argument that he made in general debate upon this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. Cheerfully.

Mr. CANNON. By no manner of means do I claim that an estimate should be allowed in full as it is made. My only claim was and is that in instances where I criticized, the good of the public service and its efficiency was not benefited by withholding appropriations under the reduction of estimates as recommended by a majority of the committee. I did not discuss it at length and in detail, but I am prepared, under the five-minute rule, to justify at least myself to myself in the general statements that I made.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I shall be gratified if the gentleman, in discussion under the five-minute rule, shall change the impression that his speech made upon my mind. I was loath to believe that he had shifted the position which he had occupied for years as a Member of this House.

But, Mr. Chairman, coming now to a discussion of the items that are carried in this bill, I shall not occupy the attention of the committee for very long. I do not feel that it is necessary to enlarge upon the statement made by my colleague from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]; but there has been some criticism aimed at the action of the majority of the committee touching the bill as it is reported to the House for its failure to appropriate for the continuance of the so-called Tariff Board. My distinguished colleague on the committee [Mr. CANNON] entered into this criticism of the committee. In other words, he defended the so-called Tariff Board. I hope he did not do violence to his own conscience. He certainly did violence to his past record as touching this question. I am not going to discuss it, because others will, under the five-minute rule, discuss at length, I imagine, the wisdom of the majority of the committee in refusing to appropriate for the continuance of this board. I shall only say in passing that the Republican Party, in power in this country for 16 years, has been constantly during that time, until 1909, opposed to a Tariff Board or anything that was like a Tariff Board. They have opposed it whenever it was proposed upon the floor of this House to be written into legislation. They discovered, Mr. Chairman, only after the country had repudiated their position upon this question, that they needed advice upon this question. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It would have been vastly better for them, possibly, as a political party if they had had some board to advise them when they were enacting into law the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. It is our asset that they had no such advice, but because of their lack of information—not that they were not informed—but because of their lack of regard for the taxpayers of this country when they wrote this iniquity upon the statute books accounts to-day for the fact they are in the minority in this House and in November will be a minority in all branches of this Government. [Applause.]

After they had seen the handwriting upon the wall they pleaded for somebody to advise them how to write a tariff law. We are very much obliged to you, gentlemen, but we think we know what we want to write to relieve the taxpayers of this country from burdens which have been placed upon them by the tax laws that you have written upon the statute books.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to him the complaint of the country in the past has not been as to what came to the Ways and Means Committee but what came from it.

Mr. PAGE. Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, this great question of taxation through our tariff laws, whatever they may say and however they may try to shift the question that attracts the attention of the people at an approaching election, that is the question before the American people, and upon it will be decided the fate of parties and of men. Why, the Republican Party in the past 20 years has occupied varying and shifting positions upon this great question, except in one particular. They have continuously told the American public that they wanted protection. They started this great propaganda for infant industries. When those industries have grown into giants and monopolies, they have increased the amount of food that the infants required. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They have declared from time to time that it was for the protection not of manufacturers alone and for the infant industries of the country, but for the protection of the labor of the country. I can recall the day when men in the Republican Party who advocated the principle of protection boldly declared that the for-

eigner paid the tax. They were driven by public sentiment from that position and they have not made that statement for years. Then they have brought the claim that by this system they made it possible for the American manufacturer to maintain the wage of the American workman, and now one of their candidates for the nomination for the Presidency has enunciated for the Republican Party a new doctrine absolutely, and that is that it must be written into the law that the laborer must have his share. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I wonder what gentleman on that side is going to be commissioned to write this effectively into the law of the land.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion again, it is the first equitable proposition in connection with the protective tariff of which I have heard.

Mr. PAGE. But an absolutely impracticable proposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true.

Mr. PAGE. To pass on to other matters, the Tariff Board, in the judgment of this side of the House, has not justified its existence, and for that reason the Committee on Appropriations has used the only means within its power, and that is the withholding of appropriations that made it possible. When this bill was first reported, as a member of the committee reporting it I was asked by a number of Members what the action of the committee had been touching the Economy Commission. Mr. Chairman, the fact that this bill carries in amount of appropriations \$33,000,000 less than the current law is the most striking evidence that can be given to the House and to the country that at least the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations and this House are in favor of economy in the Government service. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know that over on the other side of that aisle there have been coming a great many slurs and insinuations at this side of the House as to its professions of economy, and I think an answer to that will be made upon the last day of this session of Congress when the statement of cold facts is given to the people of the country, and for one I am ready to await that statement and the judgment of the people as touching it.

I know we have not economized to that degree that a great many of us would have liked. I am free to say that there are economies, in my judgment, that might have been effected that have not been effected, and some of these economies that might have been effected have not been effected on account of the solid vote against them on that side of the Chamber.

In speaking of the Economy Commission appointed by the President for the investigation of the executive departments of the Government and the methods of the administration of those departments looking to economies of expenditure, they have made partial reports to the President and to the Congress of the United States. The subcommittee had before it representatives of this commission and patiently for three days listened to their testimony touching not only what they had accomplished but the plans they had for the accomplishment of other things. We took into consideration the recommendations they had made both to the President and through him to the Congress. It is somewhat significant in this connection that this testimony taken before the subcommittee brought out the fact that the commission of the President, of his creation and reporting to him, made reports to the President of reforms that might be effected, saving thousands of dollars to the Government, as long ago as last December—reforms that required absolutely nothing except the Executive order of the President of the United States to put them into operation—and while six months have elapsed no order has been issued to put into effect these reforms that have been recommended by his own board. I recognize the fact that during this period of time the President has been very busy. Other things have occupied his mind and his time to the exclusion possibly of some of the things that would have saved the Government a mint of money. But, as a matter of fact, no Executive order has been issued based upon the recommendations of this board that would save the Government a dollar in its expenditure with perhaps one or two slight exceptions.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman were President, would he pursue the same course?

Mr. PAGE. The gentleman who is now addressing the committee has never for a moment contemplated what he would do if he were President, because he never had any aspirations or hopes of reaching that position.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope he will pursue it with better success, anyway.

Mr. MANN. The Economy Commission reports, being called to the attention of the departments, and there being some question as to the applicability in each case to each department, do

you not think it ought to be settled how these reforms can reach out in these departments rather than have the President issue half-baked resolutions applying these things to the various departments?

Mr. PAGE. I have no intention to be unfair to the President or to anybody else. I will admit that there is something in the suggestion, made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that it does take time to work out any great reforms. I only have this observation to make, and it is based upon my conclusion from the evidence that has come into the possession of the committee upon which I serve—not only the testimony of the gentlemen who are members of this Economy Commission, but statements made by various gentlemen connected with the several departments of the Government—that if the President waits until there is accord on the part of the bureaus and departments of the Government in the recommendations that have been made by the commission he will have to serve more than three terms before he gets one of these Executive orders into effect.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman agree with the President about that? Would the gentleman, if he had the power, issue an order directing that all these recommendations of the Economy Commission be in force?

Mr. PAGE. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, of course, can not differentiate himself in the first instance.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say to the gentleman, in my judgment, as he has put the question to me, if I were President and there were recommendations made by this board to me that were so patent as to the feasibility of their operation and so clearly setting forth the saving of public money, I should put them into commission. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I have read the report of the Economy Commission. I have no doubt that the gentleman from North Carolina has done so. I have read all the reports carefully and annotated them. I would like to say to the gentleman if he has found very many recommendations on which he would issue a sweeping order and put in force in every department of the country I am very much surprised.

Mr. PAGE. That some reforms have been worked out by the Economy Commission that are valuable is undoubtedly true. I agree with the committee in retaining the commission. But I doubt whether any gentleman would have ordered them to be put in force in all of the departments, and necessarily it is impossible for the President carefully to examine all of the recommendations of the Economy Commission and himself to judge, in the first instance, without hearing from his department officers as to whether they should be adopted or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the gentleman—

Mr. SHERLEY. I would suggest that the President exercise enough discretion to send to Congress recommendations as to things concerning which he needed congressional action.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; I was going to mention that. He has sent in recommendations asking that they be enacted into law.

Mr. MANN. I would be very much surprised if the committee had acted upon them, and the committee, as a matter of fact, has not done it. The committee has not proposed to act upon them.

Mr. PAGE. Not all of them, but some of them. My only complaint is that the President has not put into effect any of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will admit that few people who are familiar with the Government service would propose to put some of them into execution.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is complaining because the recommendations have not been put into effect by a sweeping Executive order.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I mean to say again that I did not want to make any unfair criticism of the President. If I had any desire to enter into a criticism of the gentleman who occupies that high and exalted position, I should have attacked him through some other channel than the Economy Commission. I have no desire and I do not want to be unfair to him, but I want to say that this commission in its report has recommended certain matters in connection with the filing of papers and the handling of papers in the various departments of the Government that they say will save the Government a million dollars annually. Now, it does seem to me that that is a matter that could be determined inside of six months, as to whether or not that recommendation should be put into operation.

Further, they recommended that \$50,000 could be saved by the use of the window envelope. This has been partially put

into operation by the President. Then they have recommended various and sundry other things. In their recommendations they said that \$50,000 could be saved by the discontinuance of affidavits appended to personal-expense vouchers. The committee has written into this bill a provision that will save that \$50,000—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Without dispensing with the affidavits.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; without dispensing with the affidavits.

There was also a recommendation that concerned necessary legislation that could be put into operation touching the mailing of public documents. This committee has incorporated a provision carrying that into effect and carrying into effect the recommendation of the Economy Commission and the recommendation of the President as to another reform. They have recommended that a million dollars could be saved in the travel of officers and employees of the Government by the use of mileage books. That does not require legislative action. It seems to me that is a matter that could be worked out by the Executive in less time than six months. My only criticism is that those things which, in my judgment, might have been effected by an Executive order have not been put into operation.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman sure that that does not take any legislation?

Mr. PAGE. That is my opinion—that it does not take any legislation.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may be correct, but I think he is wrong.

Mr. PAGE. Well, I may be wrong, and in the estimation of the gentleman from Illinois most of us are oftener wrong than right.

Mr. MANN. Well, as to the gentleman's side, that is absolutely true.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MALBY. I want to ask my colleague on the committee whether it does not appear from all our hearings of representatives of the various departments that they are now using mileage books wherever they can?

Mr. PAGE. Oh, no.

Mr. MALBY. I would be glad if the gentleman would state one department where they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman such additional time as he desires.

Mr. PAGE. I thank the gentleman. Now, I can not undertake to carry in my mind all the statements that were made in 3,000 pages of hearings—

Mr. MALBY. Of course not all of them—

Mr. PAGE. And this matter of mileage books came up in connection with almost every department, and my recollection is that almost every gentleman who appeared before the committee and to whom questions were propounded touching the propriety of using mileage books was ready to offer some reason why it could not be done. In other words, they were antagonistic to this recommendation of the Economy Commission.

Mr. MALBY. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MALBY. I acknowledge that the gentleman can not recall everything in 3,000 printed pages of hearings; but when he revises his remarks, as he probably will, if he can find a single official in any department of the Government who said that he would refuse to use mileage books on any such grounds, I hope he will put the statement in the Record.

Mr. PAGE. I have not found any department that refuses to use them, because there has been no order issued requiring them to be used.

Mr. MALBY. Or anybody who had neglected to use them.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that the Interstate Commerce Commission, that was supposed to know peculiarly about the subject of rates, was asked about the matter, and the suggestion was made by myself that they investigate the recommendation of the Economy Commission, and they promised to do so immediately.

Mr. PAGE. I recall very clearly that particular paragraph in the hearings.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. GILLET. I should like to ask the gentleman whether it is not a fact that, although the President has not adopted all the recommendations of the Economy Board, yet this administration right here in Washington has introduced reforms in methods of administration which have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

Mr. PAGE. In the Treasury Department.

Mr. GILLET. In the executive departments.

Mr. PAGE. In one department of the Government that is true, and the Treasury Department has instituted economies and reforms that are saving quite a sum of money in the administration of the department, and we have always given them credit for it, and did so in the report that was made to this House on the legislative bill.

Mr. HAY. Were these reforms in the Treasury Department the result of the recommendations of this Economy Commission?

Mr. PAGE. No; they were not. But I started out, not to criticize the President altogether, but to say that we believe that there are so many reforms that might be worked out to the advantage of the taxpayers of the country in the administration of the executive branch of this Government, and we have been so impressed with the fact that this commission would find some of these things, and that some of them, at any rate, would, on account of the work of this commission, be placed in effective operation, that we were not willing to assume the responsibility of discontinuing the existence of the commission. We did feel that we were justified in reducing the number of the chief officers of the commission.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. How many officers did they have?

Mr. PAGE. As now constituted, there are five members of the commission—a chairman and four other gentlemen—together with a secretary.

Mr. HAY. How much do those six men receive?

Mr. PAGE. The chairman of the commission receives a salary of \$10,000 a year. Three of the commission receive salaries of \$6,000 a year. The fourth member of the commission receives \$40 a day for each day that he is engaged in this work, but his compensation must not exceed \$6,000 in any one year.

Mr. HAY. Has he been drawing \$6,000 a year under that arrangement?

Mr. PAGE. Yes; my information is that he has worked enough days to get the limit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He has worked about half a year.

Mr. PAGE. About half a year.

Mr. HAY. How much is appropriated in all for this commission?

Mr. PAGE. They have had \$175,000 in all. The estimate submitted to this Congress is \$75,000.

Mr. HAY. Out of that they propose to pay \$10,000 to one man and \$6,000 to each of four men.

Mr. PAGE. Forty thousand dollars went for salaries, including the secretary.

Mr. HAY. To six men?

Mr. PAGE. Yes.

Mr. HAY. How many clerks have they?

Mr. PAGE. I have forgotten the number of men they have employed; but quite a number.

Mr. HAY. How many rooms have they at their disposal?

Mr. PAGE. I do not know that. I can not answer the gentleman in detail offhand. They are occupying considerable space.

Mr. HAY. About 14 rooms, have they not?

Mr. PAGE. I can not say as to the number of rooms.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I think it is only fair to the commission to say that they filed a detailed statement as to their rents and their expenses for furnishings and otherwise. That statement was quite satisfactory in every particular. I had the impression that they had been very extravagant because it had been commonly rumored that that was so, but these details which they have furnished are very full and complete.

Mr. PAGE. It is only fair to the commission to say that they have filed a detailed statement, showing not only the men that they have employed and the salaries they have received, but the rooms that they occupy and the rents they pay.

Mr. HAY. Who are these men who occupy these high-salaried places on the commission? Where do they come from?

Mr. PAGE. The chairman of the commission—

Mr. HAY. I understand about the chairman.

Mr. PAGE. I will read the biographies of this commission:

Frederick A. Cleveland, chairman: Age, 46. Salary as chairman of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$10,000 per annum; appointed March 8, 1911. Official positions previously held: Instructor of finance, University of Pennsylvania, 1900 to 1902; professor of finance, School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, New York University, 1903 to 1905; member of commission on finance and taxation appointed by Mayor McClellan, of the city of New York, 1905 to 1906; member of committee appointed by Comptroller Metz for the revision of accounts and administrative methods of New York, 1907 to 1908; member of committee on office methods and practices, appointed

by Controller Prendergast, city of New York; director bureau of municipal research, Philadelphia; director bureau of municipal research, New York City.

William F. Willoughby: Age, 44. Salary as member of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$6,000 per annum; appointed March 8, 1911. Official positions previously held: Expert, Department of Labor, 1890 to 1901; treasurer of Porto Rico, 1901 to 1907; secretary of Porto Rico and president of the Executive Council of Porto Rico, 1907 to 1909; Assistant Director of the Census, 1909 to 1911.

Walter W. Warwick: Age, 43. Salary as member of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$6,000 per annum; appointed April 20, 1911. Official positions previously held: Clerk to United States circuit judge, 1892 to 1893; confidential clerk, law clerk, and chief law clerk, Treasury Department, 1893 to 1898, and 1905 to 1908; deputy auditor Isthmian Canal Commission (Washington office), 1904 to 1905; examiner of accounts of the Isthmian Canal Commission and auditor of the government of the Canal Zone (on duty on the Isthmus), 1908 to 1911; appointed associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Canal Zone, 1911. (Did not enter on duties of office last named because of appointment as member of the commission.)

Frank J. Goodnow: Age, 53. Salary as member of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$6,000 per annum; appointed April 20, 1911. Official positions previously held: Professor of law, Columbia University, New York, since 1883; member of commission appointed by Gov. Roosevelt in 1900 to revise the charter of the city of New York; member of commission on finance and taxation appointed by Mayor McClellan, of the city of New York, 1905; member of commission appointed by Mayor Gaynor to inquire into the causes of congestion of population in New York, 1910; delegate of the United States Government to the first Congress of Administrative Science, at Brussels, 1910.

Harvey S. Chase: Age, 50. Salary as member of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$40 per day while on duty at Washington, without cost to the Government for traveling and personal expenses, the total cost per annum not to exceed \$6,000; appointed June 30, 1911. Official positions previously held: Consulting expert in the installation of uniform systems of accounting for the State of Ohio, 1902; expert for finance commission of the city of Boston, 1908 to 1910; expert for governor of State of Massachusetts, 1910 to 1911; president of Massachusetts Society of Public Accountants; trustee and member of executive committee of American Association of Public Accountants.

Merritt O. Chance, secretary: Age, 42. Salary as secretary of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, \$6,000 per annum; appointed March 8, 1911. Official positions previously held: Assistant messenger, Post Office Department, 1888; clerk, War Department, 1890; clerk, Post Office Department, 1891 to 1894; clerk and private secretary to Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, 1895 to 1899; chief clerk, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, 1899 to 1901; private secretary to the Secretary of War, 1901 to 1904; superintendent of post-office supplies, Post Office Department, 1904; chief clerk, Post Office Department, 1905 to 1908; Auditor for the Post Office Department, 1908 to 1911.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. I want to observe that in view of the interesting biographies of these gentlemen, and from the comfortable salaries they now enjoy, it strikes me as a standing refutation of the old proverb that "a rolling stone gathers no moss." [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE. I think that is a very apt observation.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not a fact that the secretary of this commission, who was formerly an auditor of the Post Office Department, is the one that largely helped to put into operation the reforms in the Treasury Department?

Mr. PAGE. I can not answer the gentleman, because I do not know of my own knowledge.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the amount of money expended for the services of this commission up to now is \$175,000.

Mr. PAGE. That amount has been appropriated up to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. But not expended. The commission has been in office about a year?

Mr. PAGE. More than a year. They went into office, the most of them, on the 8th of April, 1911.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman state what the amount saved thus far has been as the result of the recommendations made by the commission?

Mr. PAGE. I can not; and neither can anybody else. To be entirely frank, I do not think it fair to test the value of this commission by the results to this date, because it necessarily takes time to work out and carry into effect reforms as far-reaching as are needed in the various departments of the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. That is exactly what I wanted the gentleman to state.

Mr. PAGE. For that reason the Appropriations Committee did not feel warranted in discontinuing the appropriation and the commission, because it did not feel that there had been sufficient time for them to demonstrate whether or not their work was of real value.

Mr. MADDEN. What I was fearful of was that the gentleman would leave the impression on the minds of Members of the House that the commission had rendered no service of any value.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman thought that, he should not have voted to continue the commission.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I do not believe that; I believe that they are of value.

Mr. PAGE. I think they may be of value, and we were willing to give them a chance. Personally I had this sort of mental reservation—that if they did not make good, after the 4th of next March a Democratic President could discontinue them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentlemen may not have the pleasure of recognizing that right under a Democratic President.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman said either that he had reduced the number or the pay of the commission, as I understood him.

Mr. PAGE. We have a provision which provides that not more than three persons shall receive from this appropriation a salary in excess of \$4,000 per annum. The committee did that because, recognizing that there was a possibility of accomplishing a real economy through the activities of these gentlemen, we thought it was a little bit overorganized or top-heavy, and I think the House will agree with us.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have occupied vastly more time, not only on the Economy Commission but upon other things, than I started out to.

Before taking my seat there are one or two other matters that I desire to advert to. The other day, when the chairman of the committee was making his statement to the House, there was a great deal of interest elicited, not only on that side of the Chamber—for while most of the questions came from that side they were of as acute interest on this side—touching the appropriations carried in this bill for the Isthmian Canal.

Upon the face of it, as explained by the chairman, a reduction of \$13,000,000 in the appropriation for the Isthmian Canal might make an impression on the minds of some gentleman who has not had an opportunity to inform himself as being calculated to retard or hinder the execution and completion of this great project. I want to assure the membership of the House that not only have we not been guilty of cutting the appropriation for that great work, but I want to assure gentlemen on that side of the House—and the record in the past will bear me out—that this side of the House has never done anything to hinder the construction of the Panama Canal, and it has been one of the great enterprises of this Government upon which there has been no party division.

We are as much in earnest and are as much concerned about the continuance and completion of the work as gentlemen on that side of the Chamber can be. If I believed that there was a single item in this bill that did not carry a sufficient amount of money to carry on this work with all the speed that the great organizer who is the head of the Isthmian Canal Commission had planned, I should not support it, but would gladly increase the amount.

I want to say upon my personal responsibility that aside from the hearings to guide the committee and that are within the reach of every Member of the House, the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, when last in Washington—I believe in April—appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations making up this bill, and we then went over item by item the estimates that had been submitted and the amounts that in his judgment would be necessary for the coming fiscal year.

Unfortunately, I think now we did not have present at that hearing a reporter to take down what was said, but I took the precaution while Col. Goethals was making this statement to take my committee copy of the bill appropriating for the Isthmian Canal, and item by item I wrote in the margin of that bill the exact amount that Col. Goethals said was necessary to continue the work during the next 12 months. When we came to write the appropriations in the bill, I insisted—no, it took no insistence, because we agreed that every dollar that he had indicated he needed should be written in the bill, and it is written in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the record does not show which came to the gentleman's knowledge, but under the five-minute rule I will read from the record as it is what Col. Goethals and the Chief of Staff said touching the appropriations for the Panama Canal.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I prefaced my remarks by the statement that the committee was in possession of information that did not appear in the public hearings, and I said I thought it was unfortunate that it did not appear in the public hearings. My memory is not exactly clear, but I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], a member of that subcommittee, while possibly not present during the entire time that Col. Goethals was making his statement, did come into the room and heard at least a part of the statements that Col. Goethals made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not recollect in 3,000 pages of evidence, and could not say whether I was present at the time the gentleman refers to or not. I get my information from the record of the two officers, who were chiefly responsible, as well as from an estimate sent by the Secretary of War in April, and I stated the matter in perfect good faith. The whole matter can be threshed out later under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAGE. O Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend that in anything I have said I did not have in mind any statement he made the other day, nor did I intend to reflect upon anything he said.

Mr. CANNON. The whole matter can be threshed out under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask the gentleman a question, and I hope he will not consider it a reflection upon the committee.

Mr. PAGE. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. But does the gentleman think it quite fair to the House for the Committee on Appropriations to take testimony to the extent of 3,000 printed pages upon the sundry civil appropriation bill and then on as important an item as the Panama Canal to base its figures for appropriation upon secret testimony not taken down and furnished to the House, but which the gentleman himself undertakes to furnish orally to the House?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman constantly appeals to me and to other gentlemen on this side of the Chamber in the interest of fairness. It might come from other gentlemen with better grace. He is not himself always fair. I want to say that this is not the first time that the appropriations for the Isthmian Canal have been made upon testimony that did not appear in the record, but I prefaced my statement by saying that I personally thought it was unfortunate that it did not appear in the record, but I was stating merely the facts as they existed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he replied to my question with an epithet, but that is all.

Mr. PAGE. That is the usual brand of fairness that the gentleman from Illinois deals in in this House.

Mr. MANN. That is the usual brand of fairness the gentleman exhibits.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself, I think a proper consideration and weighing of the testimony which is printed, plus that knowledge that comes to men who have visited the canal and who are familiar with conditions, warrants, without reference to anything else, every recommendation that we have made in the bill.

I am willing to meet the case on the record as printed, although it is true, as stated by the gentleman, in order that we might be sure that we make no mistake we had this informal conference with the chief engineer, Col. Goethals, and it is also true that during that conference the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] came in and attended part of it.

Mr. PAGE. I agree entirely with my colleague from Kentucky that we can justify the items carried in this bill from the printed testimony.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow.

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. I get my only knowledge touching the matter in controversy from the evidence as printed. I was not constant in attendance, owing to my duty as a Member and otherwise, upon the hearings of this committee, and I can not say that what the gentleman states as to Col. Goethals's statement that does not appear in the record is not correct, because I regard the gentleman—have always and do now, both gentlemen—as being truthful men, but I want to say that I have no recollection of any statement that Col. Goethals made in the premises that does not appear in the record.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me make this statement: There should be no misunderstanding about what happened. Before

Col. Goethals was ready to leave the city and return to the Isthmus, at my request, he reexamined the estimates submitted and agreed to do what had been the practice in other years—to indicate to the committee what sums could be eliminated, because of the later information he had that they would not be required. He came to the committee room one morning and I invited him into my office. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] came to the committee room and he came in. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] came to the committee room and he came in. It was not a prearranged meeting. We asked Mr. Courts, clerk to the committee, to come in, and the matter was being discussed when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] came in and inquired what was being done.

Within a short time the gentleman from Illinois stated that he had to attend to some other matter that had previously been arranged to occupy his attention and was compelled to leave. During this informal conference these figures were taken from Col. Goethals and noted by those present on their books. In some respects the sums recommended are somewhat different from the sums stated by Col. Goethals, but the differences are not very great, and no different in such respect than the changes made on other occasions. There was no intention nor attempt either to withhold information or to misrepresent. My only purpose now is to prevent any misunderstanding because I believe and I am aware that everybody desires to make such recommendations for the canal as may be necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Just let me state in justice to myself it might be inferred from the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky and the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina that I was present when something was said that does not appear in the record. I do not recollect that it presented itself as the gentleman from New York states, but I rely upon the printed record where there is a record. I do not dispute what the gentleman states.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that. I simply wished to make that statement so there will be no misunderstanding that there was any attempt to obtain information that would not be accessible to everybody.

Mr. CANNON. I do not so intimate.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit. There was nothing in my statement that should ruffle the most sensitive nerve of the gentleman from Illinois. I am not reflecting upon him at all. He has made such criticisms of the bill as he saw proper. That is all right. I know I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for five years or more and we have dealt with the Panama Canal in this instance in no different way than we dealt with it in years gone by while Republicans were in control, and there was not the slightest intention on my part, and I am sure there was not on the part of any Democratic member on the committee, to in any way impede the work. I say this not because of what the gentleman from Illinois has said, but more particularly because of the statement that has gone out in the press.

There was in a morning paper in Washington to-day a statement to the effect that we had made a cut that was not only incomprehensible but the inference was that it was absolutely indefensible. Now, if the man who wrote that editorial had taken the trouble to read the hearings and obtained the information therein contained he would never have written it, but it is in keeping with much that has gone out to the public touching the recommendations for appropriations that happen to be below the estimates. The only way we can please some gentlemen in and out of the House is by giving exactly what any department asks, whether they need the money or not.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me just there?

Mr. PAGE. I will yield to the gentleman, but I will say there is some pressure being brought to bear upon me to close, and I desire to close my remarks in a few minutes.

Mr. CANNON. All I wanted to say was this. I do not know the gentlemen to whom the gentleman from Kentucky refers as being in the House who are not pleased unless full estimates are given. Those out of the House I do not know nor care.

I want to say to the gentleman that I am one of the Members of the House that never rush to the newspapers to give real information or misinformation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I take the gentleman's disclaimer. It was not necessary, because I did not suppose he had gone to the newspaper.

Mr. CANNON. After all, I am a Member of the House, and there is this omission in the appropriation, and I am willing to wait for the consideration of it.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure when we come to the consideration of the items appropriating for the Panama Canal, under the five-minute rule, that those of us who are responsible for the amounts in this bill can justify to the House and to the

country that the appropriations we have made are not only ample for the continuation of that great work, but that they meet the approval of the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, reverting to one other matter, and in conclusion—because while other gentlemen have occupied a great deal of time that has been charged up to me, I have occupied a great deal more than was anticipated—I want before I close to revert to one other question.

Mr. MADDEN. May I interrupt the gentleman from North Carolina with relation to the canal?

Mr. PAGE. If you will be brief.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know whether the force on the canal has been reduced? If so, how much?

Mr. PAGE. I think the information before the committee is that it has been materially reduced within the last six months.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the committee any information as to the number of men employed on the canal now?

Mr. PAGE. I think the latest testimony before the committee as to the number of men employed was at the time of the taking of the testimony on the Isthmus, in November, when the committee was there.

Mr. MADDEN. How does that compare with the previous years?

Mr. PAGE. I can not tell the gentleman, except that there was a reduction.

Mr. MADDEN. The reason I am asking these questions is this: It was with the idea, in fact, of ascertaining whether or not the force had been reduced sufficiently to justify a proportionate reduction.

Mr. PAGE. I think that is not only true, but the gentleman also knows that in the progress of the construction of the canal the efficiency of those employed has been vastly increased, much beyond the expectation of even the men who had the work in charge. In addition to the money appropriated in this bill, and I feel it is only fair to say that, they will have at least \$5,000,000 of a surplus from the appropriations of last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been some evidence that there will be controversy upon the floor of the House relating to one other item when it is reached in the bill. I want at this stage of the discussion to submit just a few remarks concerning a belated estimate, although a great many belated estimates come before this committee, coming in even after the bill was ready to report to the House. There was one sent in by the Treasury Department recommending the appropriation of \$500,000 for what is known as the epidemic fund—a fund that has existed since the nineties—to enable the President to suppress outbreaks of epidemics of contagious diseases specified in the original enactment, and quite a sum of money has been expended through the Marine-Hospital Service in the suppression of outbreaks of yellow fever, cholera, and the bubonic plague. The last appropriation made for this fund was carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill of 1909, and was in amount \$750,000. In the years 1907 and 1908 there was an outbreak in the cities on the Pacific coast of bubonic plague, and a considerable amount of this money was expended under the authority of law and under the direction of the President for the stamping out of this oriental disease that has made its way to our shores. First and last, there has been expended from this fund in California a sum exceeding a million dollars. While there has not been a case of bubonic plague in a human being on the Pacific coast, I believe, since 1909, there is still being expended under this service about \$14,000 a month in the eradication of rats and ground squirrels that are the conveyors of this disease to human beings.

I have no criticism to make of the expenditures that have been made from this fund by direction of the President and through this organization upon the Pacific coast and elsewhere. But it appeared to the committee that there was approximately \$100,000 of this fund yet unexpended, and that the expenditures were almost entirely confined to the State of California for the exterminating of ground squirrels, at the rate of about \$14,000 a month, and a simple calculation in arithmetic will demonstrate that it will not take the \$100,000 carried in this appropriation to continue this work during the next year.

But, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I want to say that in the judgment of some people very much nearer to the existence of this supposed plague than those of us who are legislating here in Washington, the danger of the spread of the bubonic plague is a thing of the past in California, and it is due largely to the vigilance and the active work of the officials of the Marine-Hospital Service. It has cost, under the testimony submitted to the committee, something like \$1,500 for every infected ground squirrel that has been killed in California. It is a pretty expensive hunting expedition. But it

appeared to the committee—and it had some weight as to the amount of money that we appropriated for the continuance of this work upon the Pacific coast—that the State of California itself failed to make any appropriation for the continuance of this work during the last session of its legislature, or if there was legislation enacted it was vetoed by the governor.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there is a general law in the State of California which makes the charge a lien upon the property whenever the owner refuses to do his share of the work of killing the rodents upon his property and the local government performs that work? The cost of the extermination is a lien upon the property. Is the gentleman also aware of the fact that there is scarcely a county in the State of California having infected ground squirrels and rats where the owners of property and the counties themselves have refused to make appropriation for this work?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, the fact that the gentleman states may be true. I do not care to controvert and can not controvert it, but the fact remains that the lien that the gentleman speaks of is absolutely ineffective because of the lack of legislative action on the part of the State of California to make it effective.

Mr. KAHN. I know the gentleman does not want to misstate the facts.

Mr. PAGE. Well, then, will the gentleman state the situation briefly?

Mr. KAHN. The policy of the Government is to go into those counties where there are large Government reserves. At present the counties are doing their work against the squirrels on land within their boundaries, but on the Government reserves the Government ought to do the work.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, the testimony had before the committee does not correspond with the statement made by the gentleman from California—that Government money is to be expended only on Government land. On the contrary, the statement is in the record, made by the head of the Marine-Hospital Service, that this money has been expended in the various counties of California and in the cities outside, largely, of the Government reserves.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE. The gentleman will excuse me. I am not going to make any further statement that he will controvert.

Mr. KAHN. I only want the gentleman to be fair toward the taxpayers of California.

Mr. PAGE. Oh, the gentleman will have ample time in which to discuss this subject under the five-minute rule.

Mr. KAHN. I am quite sure that the gentleman in his speech does not intend to make any unfair statement.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I will say in conclusion that while the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] expressed his willingness to appropriate any amount of money that might be required for this fund, the committee felt absolutely justified in appropriating only the amount carried in this bill, on the ground that it was ample to meet any emergency that might arise, and has felt sure that the efficiency of the Marine-Hospital Service and our quarantine service, and its increased efficiency, if you please, has made it and will make it less necessary from year to year to expend large sums of money to keep out epidemics and plagues.

And now, Mr. Chairman, one word more and I shall close. I have been led far astray from the remarks that I intended to submit. I wanted only to point out in the bill, or in connection with the bill, some things that, in my judgment, confirmed by the testimony taken, would justify the committee in reductions that have been made in the appropriations carried by this appropriation bill.

We are willing as a committee to say to our colleagues on this side of the House and to our colleagues on that side of the House that we believe every single item carried by an appropriation in this bill is ample for the service for which it is appropriated; and in spite of the fact that the statement has repeatedly been made that we will be faced by deficits and deficiency appropriations I do not believe that even if the country is afflicted with a Republican administration for another four years, and God forbid, we will have deficiencies under these appropriations; and I know that if the future brings what we are expecting and what our friends on the other side of the Chamber are about ready to concede, a Democratic administration, we shall have, under this Democratic administration, not a deficit, but an economical administration of the executive departments of this Government that will bring surpluses and not deficiencies in the appropriations under this bill a year from now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, for the objects hereinafter expressed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, namely:

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 25039) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GETTYSBURG ANNIVERSARY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request for a change of reference.

The Clerk read as follows:

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs is discharged from further consideration of S. 6964, an act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain provisions for the care of the participants in the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, at Gettysburg, Pa., on the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th days of July, 1913, and making appropriation of a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this bill and the same is referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. What is that request?

The SPEAKER. To change the reference of the bill to make arrangements to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. The change of reference is requested at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANN. I will not object; but I do not see what jurisdiction the Committee on Appropriations has.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A bill was introduced in the House and it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The Senate passed a bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I called the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the fact that the two bills ought to be in the hands of one committee. I have no particular desire to control the matter.

Mr. MANN. This is a Senate bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations would have jurisdiction to report it if it is a Senate bill referred to that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VIEWS OF MINORITY ON COTTON BILL (H. REPT. NO. 829, PT. 2).

Mr. PAYNE. The views of the minority were to be filed today on the cotton bill, H. R. 25034. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] who has them is not here just now. I ask that the time be extended for one day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend the time for one day in which to file the views of the minority on the cotton bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9061. An act limiting hours of daily services of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5910. An act granting to the city of Portland, Oreg., certain strips of land from the post-office and customhouse sites in said city for street purposes; and

S. 6848. An act authorizing the Cooper River Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of South Carolina, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Goose Creek, in Berkeley County, S. C.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 7002. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to Salt Lake City, Utah, a right of way over certain

public land for reservoir purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

DUPLICATE ENGROSSED COPY OF IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution (H. Res. 574) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to furnish the House of Representatives with a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 3175) entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I will ask who makes this request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. The engrossed bill has been lost or mislaid, and we are merely asking for a copy of it.

Mr. MANN. Where was it lost?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. We have had so many of these losses, I should like to have some explanation.

Mr. BURNETT. The Clerk's books show that the bill was signed for by the messenger of our committee, and the clerk of our committee says he has not seen the bill; that it has not reached him.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if the enrolling clerk holds the receipt of the Committee on Immigration?

Mr. BURNETT. The messenger does.

Mr. MANN. What was the bill?

Mr. BURNETT. The bill known as the Dillingham immigration bill, a Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman's resolution is asking for a copy.

Mr. MANN. I have a curiosity to know, Mr. Speaker, how so many engrossed bills get lost—whether it is because we dispensed with the messenger whose business it was to deliver bills to the committees. I suspect that is the reason.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama states that the clerk of the enrolling committee has the receipt of his messenger. That is as far as the Chair has obtained any information.

Mr. MANN. The old practice was for the messenger to take the bills to the committees and take receipts from the clerk of the committee, and very seldom was a bill lost. Now they drop them on the sidewalk between here and the Office Building. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, if any committee of the House of Representatives has a messenger who is incapable of carrying a bill from the desk to the office to which it belongs he ought to be fired.

Mr. MANN. There are many messengers around here that I would not intrust with an engrossed or an enrolled bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEATH OF SENATOR NIXON, OF NEVADA.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn and painful duty to announce to the House the death of the Hon. GEORGE S. NIXON, a United States Senator from the State of Nevada. Thus has ended the life of an honored and useful servant and one who was universally respected. At some future time I shall ask that a date be set apart to pay proper tribute to his memory. I now offer the following resolutions, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 575.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GEORGE S. NIXON, a Senator of the United States from the State of Nevada.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the committee of Members to attend the funeral as follows: Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada, Mr. LANGHAM of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOWMAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAKER of California, Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia, Mr. DYER of Missouri, Mr. GOULD of Maine, Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts, Mr. RUBEY of Missouri, Mr. LANGLEY of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Kansas, and Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 7, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting estimate of deficiencies in appropriations for the Marine Corps (H. Doc. No. 820) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. OLDFIELD, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 23568) to amend section 55 of "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 847), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 24699) extending the time for the repayment of certain war-revenue taxes erroneously collected, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 848), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 25166) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 842), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4568) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Schley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 843), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19149) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. L. R. Goodlett, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 844), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 6978) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 845), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 24598) for the relief of Jesus Silva, jr., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 849), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE of Georgia, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred sundry bills, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 528) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary" (Public act No. 475, 61st Cong., 2d sess., p. 1138), accompanied by a report (No. 846), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11497) granting an increase of pension to Perry S. Grindle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 25167) to regulate the use of public-school buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 25168) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarendon, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 25169) to tax the manufacture and sale of deadly weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25170) to tax the manufacture and sale of deadly weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 25171) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 25172) granting to Ralph Morrison rights, in so far as the interest of the United States may be affected, to construct and maintain a dam across the Osage River for the development of water power and to generate electricity, at a point about 3 miles above the town of Warsaw, Benton County, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 25173) to establish a mining experiment station at Lander, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CARTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 25174) providing for the purchase of permanent improvements on the segregated mineral lands in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 25175) granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 25176) to provide for a post-office building at El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 573) to print 100,000 copies of three-year homestead act; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Memorial of the legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking for allotment and opening of the Navajo Indian and other reservations to settlers; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, praying to be placed in judicial circuit with Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking Congress to place a specific duty on wool on the scoured-shrinkage basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, praying that Congress allot and open the Navajo Indian and other reservations to settlers; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 25166) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 25177) granting a pension to Maria C. Waste; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 25178) granting an increase of pension to Caroline McPhail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 25179) granting a pension to William H. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 25180) granting a pension to David Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 25181) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 25182) granting an increase of pension to Virgil M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 25183) granting a pension to William H. Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 25184) granting a pension to Charles Wedeke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 25185) granting a pension to David T. Kirby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25186) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary S. Brennan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 25187) for the relief of H. G. and Minna Kassahn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 25188) granting an increase of pension to William F. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25189) granting an increase of pension to Susan Keating; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 25190) granting an increase of pension to William H. Partridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 25191) granting a pension to Maud Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of members of Socialist societies of the States of West Virginia, New York, and Texas, against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the State Council of Pennsylvania, Order of Independent Americans, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the committee on American steamship affairs, relative to placing in its old position the Frying Pan Shoals (N. C.) light vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of St. Joseph Society, No. 83, Cleveland, Ohio; Townounzystero Boskieszko Seveor Yezus Society, No. 229, Plymouth Rock, Pa.; St. Joseph Society, No. 227, Dayton, Ohio; Matki Boskiej Tuchowskiej Society, No. 443, Chicago, Ill.; Gann III Sobieskiego Society, No. 27, Stamford, Conn.; Korony Polskitropi N. M. P. N. P. Society, No. 546, Chicago, Ill.; Society No. 522, Bridgeport, Ohio; N. M. P. Krol Kor Polskry Society, No. 63, La Salle, Ill.; St. Josaphate Society, No. 61, Buffalo, N. Y.; St. Stanislaus Kostker Society, No. 457, Everson, Pa.; The Polish Kas Hes I. R. K. U. Society, No. 401, Syracuse, Onstage, N. Y.; St. Adalbert Society, No. 334, East St. Louis, Ill.; St. John Evangeliska Society, No. 394, Milwaukee, Wis.; St. Mary of Perpetual Help Society, No. 328, Cicero, Ill.; and St. John Baptist Society, No. 133, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of the Order of Independent Americans, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLACKMON (by request): Petition of Tombigbee Lodge, No. 426, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, against passage of workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the State Council of Pennsylvania, Order of Independent Americans, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolutions of the Franklin Club; St. Stanislaus Society, No. 410; and St. Valentine Society, No. 383, of Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, of Cleveland, Ohio, against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Manila Merchants' Association of Manila, P. I., favoring sale of the Philippine friar lands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Daughters of Liberty of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Gardner and other bills restricting immigration, and of the American Vigilance Association of New

York, favoring passage of amendment providing inspectors and matrons on duty on vessels carrying immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Abram Mathias, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 6103 and House bill 22706, prohibiting use of trading coupons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Civil Service Reform League, against clause in House bill 24023 relative to five-year tenure of office for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CALLAWAY: Petition of citizens of the State of Texas, against passage of the Owen bill, relative to national board of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CATLIN: Petition of the Second Ward Socialist Club of St. Louis, Mo., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the St. Louis Retail Jewelers' Association, of St. Louis, Mo., against passage of Senate bill 6273 and House bill 23417, providing for amendments to the patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Jewish Women's Organizations of Chicago, Ill., protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Swedish Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rockford, Ill., in favor of the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate-commerce liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Daniel Green, of Newport, Del., and of John Tisdale, of Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring the passage of House bill 1339, to increase pensions of certain soldiers of the Civil War who lost an arm or a leg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Lloyd Odend'hal, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the proposed plan to dispense with the execution of pension vouchers as provided in House bill 18985; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of the Polish Women's Patriotic Club of Chicago, Ill., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of St. Casimirs Society, No. 579, of Passaic, N. J., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, favoring passage of House bill 18327, relative to preparation and printing of a national directory of the commercial organizations of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations of Chicago, Ill., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of the Providence Board of Trade, Providence, R. I., protesting against passage of House bill 21969, prohibiting ships interested in by railway corporations from using the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of the Manila Merchants' Association, favoring sale of the Philippine friar lands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, and Local Union No. 1715, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the State Council of Pennsylvania, Order of Independent Americans, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYBURN: Resolution of the Order of Independent Americans, Francisville Council, No. 837, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of the Dillingham bill providing literacy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Manila Merchants' Association, favoring sale of the Philippine friar lands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the 1-cent postate rate for letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Southern Shoe Retailers' Association, Memphis, Tenn., protesting against passage of the Campbell bill requiring all goods to be marked with the manufacturer's name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Resolution of the State council of Pennsylvania, State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., and Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the German-American Alliance of Philadelphia, Pa., and Arbeiter Kranken und Sterbe-Kasse of the United States, against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Manila Merchants' Association, of Manila, P. I., favoring sale of the Philippines friar lands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the State Council of Pennsylvania, Order of Independent Americans, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the legislative committee, Department of Connecticut, U. S. V. P., of Hartford, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 17470, for pensions for widows and minor children of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of voters of Charlotte, Mecklenberg County, N. C., favoring passage of an effective interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of the 1-cent postage rate for letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 7, 1912.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 783).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 30, 1912, a tabulated statement showing number of applications which have been made for the listing of lands for homestead entries within national forests under the act of June 11, 1906, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

- John T. McKnight *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 782);
- William A. McMurtrey *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 781);
- Mary E. Neal, widow of Curren G. Neal, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 780);
- Fannie R. Teal and Laura E. Fisher, daughters and sole heirs of Henry H. Neff, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 779);
- Mary L. Oliver, widow of Joseph J. Oliver, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 778);
- Daniel O'Sullivan *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 777);
- Robert T. Paine *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 776);
- Arthur S. Palmer *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 775);
- Martin S. Perkins *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 774);
- John Perrott *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 773);
- Francis M. Pickins *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 772);
- Emma J. Pinkley, widow of Samuel C. N. Pinkley, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 771);
- Louisa Pinkney, widow of Bertine Pinkney, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 770);

Elizabeth E. Power, widow of Charles A. Power, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 769);

Alva K. Skaro, Edwin A. Skaro, and Clara Skaro Stangland, children and sole heirs of Asgrim K. Skaro, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 768);

Jennie V. V. Wolcott, widow of Richmond Wolcott, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 767);

Lydia A. Whitmore, widow (remarried) of James W. George, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 766); and

Laura O. Mundy, widow of William H. Mundy, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 765).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 17260) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Mines," approved May 16, 1910, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3815) to amend an act entitled "An act to require apparatus and operators for radiocommunication on certain ocean steamers," approved June 24, 1910, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18712) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22867) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 23515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 23765) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WOOD of New Jersey managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also requested the Senate to furnish the House with a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 3175) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, the original having been lost.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the death of Hon. GEORGE S. NIXON, late a Senator from the State of Nevada.